

USAAVSCOM TR 85-A-2


UH-60 BLACK HAWK ENGINEERING SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION AND PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

11-08
58119
P-125

(NASA-CR-177360) UN-60 BLACK HAWK
ENGINEERING SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION AND
PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS Final Report, May
1983 - Jun. 1984 (Sikorsky Aircraft,
Stratford, Conn.) 125 p CSCL 01C G3/08
Unclas 43371
N37-17710



Date for general release January 1987



United States Army
Aviation Systems
Command

UH-60 BLACK HAWK ENGINEERING SIMULATION MODEL
VALIDATION AND PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

Thaddeus T. Kaplita
Sikorsky Aircraft
Division of United Technologies Corporation
Stratford, CT 06601


Prepared for
Aeroflightdynamics Directorate
U. S. Army Research and Technology
Activity (AVSCOM)
under Contract NAS2-11570
July 1985

Date for general release January 1987



National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, California 94035



United States Army
Aviation Systems
Command

FOREWORD

This report was prepared by the Sikorsky Division of United Technologies Corporation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California under Contract NAS2-11570.

This contract, to validate and update the engineering simulation model of the UH-60A BLACK HAWK helicopter at the Ames Research Center, was funded by the U. S. Army Research and Technology Laboratories (USARTL), Ames Research Center and administered by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Mr. William McKenna was the Contract Administrator and E. W. Aiken, Army Aeromechanics Laboratory, was the Technical Monitor. The Sikorsky Division Program Manager for this contract was Mr. J. Howlett. Simulation software support was provided by Messrs. K. Arifian, R. Brand, and D. Simpson.

SUMMARY

The BLACK HAWK Engineering Simulation Model is validated and updated. Model calculated data for transient responses to control inputs and for steady trimmed flight are compared with corresponding flight test data. The test data were acquired by the U. S. Army Aviation Engineering Flight Activity (USAAEFA) flying the UH-60A BLACK HAWK Helicopter S/N 77-22716, Reference (1). Ninety time histories of transient responses to step and pulse control inputs and 16 sets of steady flight data, supplied by the Army on magnetic tapes, were processed and simulated on the BLACK HAWK simulation mathematical model at Sikorsky.

Comparison plots of calculated and test data are analyzed to assess simulation model fidelity and to identify unsatisfactory areas of comparison. The existing simulation model is deemed to simulate the UH-60A BLACK HAWK with good accuracy. It is an acceptable engineering design and evaluation analytical tool. Acceptable but unsatisfactory areas are defined and potential approaches to create a more descriptive and representative simulation of the BLACK HAWK are listed and evaluated.

Modifications to update the existing simulation model are formulated. These include, in their order of priority, the following:

- Substitute main rotor torque for engine torque in main rotor moment matrix.
- Program first order lag in Load Demand Spindle (LDS) of the engine simulation.
- Update moment equations of motion for lateral CG offsets.
- Program first order lag on tail rotor downwash.
- Modify equations for main rotor wake interaction with empennage.
- Introduce equations for tail rotor downwash interaction with vertical tail in forward flight.

The collective lag in the LDS will significantly improve the rotor and engine response to collective inputs. The modified equations for rotor-wake/empennage interaction provide improved roll response to pedal inputs. The first two items are simple to implement and most important.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	i
SUMMARY	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
LIST OF SYMBOLS	viii
LIST OF REFERENCES	x
INTRODUCTION	1
BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL UPDATE	2
1.0 SIMULATION VALIDATION	2
1.1 Transient Response Data Comparison	3
1.2 Transient Response Comparison Summary	6
1.3 Steady Flight Data Comparison	8
1.4 Steady Flight Comparison Summary	11
2.0 SIMULATION MODEL UPDATE	12
2.1 Potential Approaches	12
2.2 Evaluation of Model Revisions	12
2.2.1 Collective/Fuel-Flow Coupling In Hover	12
2.2.2 High Speed Lateral/Directional Response	13
2.2.2.1 Main Rotor Yaw Moment	13
2.2.2.2 Main Rotor Downwash Correction	14
2.2.2.3 Tail Rotor Downwash Lag	15
2.2.2.4 Tail Rotor Downwash On Vertical Tail	15
2.2.2.5 Horizontal Tail Roll Damping	16
2.2.2.6 Updated Product of Inertia Terms	17
2.2.2.7 Updated Model	18
2.2.3 Variable Frequencies In Model Acceleration Time Histories	19
3.0 RECOMMENDED MODEL UPDATES	21
APPENDICES:	
I Downwash Correction Terms	110
II Updated Equations of Motion	111

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
I. ACCELERATION AND VELOCITY SENSOR LOCATIONS	23
II. BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL COMPARISON WITH FLIGHT TEST	
1. Hover	24
2. 60 Knots	25
3. 100 Knots	26
4. 120-140 Knots	27
5. 145-150 Knots	28

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

	<u>Page</u>
1 Response to a One-Inch Forward Longitudinal Stick Step Input and Recovery at 100 Knots with Aft CG, 359.6 In.	29
2 Response to a One-Inch Lateral Stick Doublet Input at 140 Knots with Forward CG, 350.4 In.	37
3 Response to a One-Inch Down Collective Stick Step Input In Hover with Aft CG, 359.4 In.	41
4 Response to a Half-Inch Right Pedal Step Input at 144 Knots with Forward CG, 352.1 In.	45
5 Response to a Half-Inch Left Pedal Step Input in Hover with Aft CG, 359.5 In.	49
6 Response to a Quarter-Inch Aft Longitudinal Stick Step Input at 60 Knots with Forward CG, 351.2 In.	51
7 Response, with SAS Engaged, to a Half-Inch Aft Longitudinal Stick Step Input at 122 Knots with Forward CG, 350.5 In.	52
8 Response, with SAS Engaged, to a One-Inch Up Collective Stick Step Input at 140 Knots with Forward CG, 350.9 In.	53
9 Level Flight Static Trim - Airspeed Sweep with Forward CG, 351.0 In.	54
10 Effect of Stabilator Angle on Lateral/Directional Static Stability - Longitudinal Characteristics at 60 Knots with Forward CG, 352.0 In.	57
11 Lateral/Directional Static Stability at 60 Knots with Forward CG, 352.0 In.	58
12 Lateral/Directional Static Stability at 100 Knots with Forward CG, 348.7 In.	60
13 Lateral/Directional Static Stability at 140 Knots with Forward CG, 351.2 In.	62
14 Longitudinal Static Stability at 60,100 and 137.5 Knots with Forward CG, 351.0 In.	64
15 Steady Climbs and Descents at 60,100 and 137.5 Knots with Forward CG, 351.0 In.	66

LIST OF FIGURES (Cont'd)

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
16	Trimmed Steady Turns at 60 and 100 Knots with Forward CG, 351.6 and 346.6 In. Respectively.	69
17	Rotor Speed Sweep at 60,100 and 137.5 Knots with Forward CG, 351.3, 345.9, and 351.6 Respectively.	72
18	Stabilator Angle Sweep at 60,100 and 137.5 knots with Forward CG, 350.7 In.	74
19	Rotor and Engine Response to a One-Inch Down Collective Step Input In Hover, Existing Model, LDS/Collective Lag = 0.0 Sec. (No Lag)	76
20	Rotor and Engine Response to a One-Inch Down Collective Step Input In Hover, Modified Model, LDS/Collective Lag = 0.75 Sec.	78
21	Helicopter Response to a One-Half Inch Right Pedal Step Input at 144 Knots, Modified Model with Calculated Fixed Stabilator Angle and Main Rotor Torque in Yaw Moment Matrix - (#2).	80
22	Rotor and Engine Response to a One-Inch Down Collective Step Input In Hover, Modified Model with LDS/Collective Lag and Main Rotor Torque in Yaw Moment Matrix - (#2).	81
23	Tail Rotor Rigging	83
24	Helicopter Response to a Half-Inch Right Pedal Step Input at 144 Knots, Modified Model (#2) with LDS/Collective Lag and Revised Downwash Correction Terms - (#5).	84
25	Helicopter Response to a Half-Inch Right Pedal Input at 144 Knots, Modified Model (#5) with 0.05 Sec. Lag on Tail Rotor Downwash - (#6).	86
26	Helicopter Response to a Half-Inch Right Pedal Input at 144 Knots, Modified Model (#6) with Tail Rotor Downwash on Vertical Tail - EXTRVT = 1.2 - (#8).	88
27	Helicopter Response to a Half-Inch Right Pedal Input at 144 Knots, Modified Model (#6) with Horizontal Tail Roll Damping - (#7).	89
28	Helicopter Response to a Half-Inch Right Pedal Input at 144 Knots, Modified Model (#8) with Updated Equations of Motion (IXZ = 1882, IXY = -213, IYZ = -66) - (#11).	90

LIST OF FIGURES (Cont'd)

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
29	Helicopter Response to a Half-Inch Right Pedal Input at 144 Knots, Modified Model (# 11) with $1.5 * IXZ = 2823$ - (# 13).	91
30	Helicopter Response to a Half-Inch Right Pedal Input at 144 Knots - Updated Model.	92
31	Helicopter Response to a One-Inch Right Pedal Pulse Input at 103 Knots with Forward CG, 348.7 In. - Updated Model.	100
32	Helicopter Angular Acceleration and Rate Response to a Half-Inch Right Pedal Step Input at 144 Knots - Updated Model with 0.01 Sec Time Interval in Plot Data File.	108

LIST OF SYMBOLS

CG	Center of Gravity
DWSHTR	Uniform downwash velocity at tail rotor disk non-dimensionalized by tail rotor tip speed.
EKTRVT	Ratio of tail rotor downwash at the vertical tail to the downwash at the tail rotor disk.
FSCG	Fuselage station of center of gravity, in.
GGRPM	Engine gas generator speed, %
h_d	Density altitude, ft
Ih1	Stabilator angle, positive leading edge up, deg
KN, KTS	Knots
LDS	Engine Load Demand Spindle
LDSCAM	Engine load demand system spindle cam, deg
LPLADD	Roll moment damping of horizontal tail, ft-lb
LT	Left
MUZTR	Velocity component parallel to tail rotor shaft and normalized by tail rotor tip speed, positive to port
NGGLDS	Engine load demand spindle cam output, %
N_r	Main rotor rotational speed, %
OMEGTR	Tail rotor rotational speed, rad/sec
OMGRAT	Main rotor rotational speed ratio, 1.0 = 100% = 27.0 rad/sec
P	Helicopter body axis roll rate, rad/sec
PS2	Location of nose accelerometer
PS3	Location of cg accelerometer
PS4	Location of velocity sensor
QFRE	Free stream dynamic pressure, lb/ft ²
RT	Right

LIST OF SYMBOLS - (Cont'd)

RTR	Tail rotor radius, ft
S	Laplace operator, 1/sec
SAV	Simulation calculated variables data file
TDW	Tail rotor downwash lag time constant, sec
THETTR	Tail rotor blade pitch angle at center of rotation, deg
TST	Flight test variables data file
TXC	LDS/Collective lag time constant, sec
VKT	True airspeed, knots
VXB	Component of airspeed along body longitudinal axis, positive forward, ft/sec
VYTRV1	Interference velocity at vertical tail due to tail rotor downwash, ft/sec
WLCG	Waterline position of center of gravity, in.
XA	Lateral cyclic stick position, positive right, in.
XB	Longitudinal cyclic stick position, positive aft, in.
XC	Collective stick position, positive up, in.
XP	Pedal position, positive right, in.
$\theta_{.75}$	Main rotor or tail rotor blade pitch angle at 0.75 blade span station, deg

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Abbott, W.Y., Benson, J.D., Oliver, R.G., and Williams, R.A., "Validation Flight Test of UH-60A For Rotorcraft Systems Integration Simulator (RSIS)," USAAEFA Project No. 79-24, September 1982.
2. Howlett, J.J., "UH-60A BLACK HAWK Engineering Simulation Program: Volume I - Mathematical Model," NASA Contractor Report 166309, December 1981.
3. Hoak, D.E., "USAF Stability and Control Datcom," Revised April 1978.
4. McFarland, R.E., "The N/Rev Phenomenon in Simulating a Blade-Element Rotor System," NASA TM-84344, March 1983.

INTRODUCTION

The United States Army Aviation Engineering Flight Activity (USAAEFA) flight tested the UH-60A BLACK HAWK Helicopter (S/N 77-22716) at Edwards Air Force Base for the Aeromechanics Laboratory (AL) of the U. S. Army Research and Technology Laboratories (USARTL). A data base was acquired from these tests for validation of the Rotorcraft Systems Integration Simulator (RSIS) developed by the U. S. Army Aviation Systems Command (AVSCOM). Data were acquired for steady trimmed flights and for transient responses to control inputs. A full description of the aircraft, test procedures and conditions, and summary results are presented in Reference (1). Subsequently, Sikorsky Aircraft was contracted to validate the BLACK HAWK Simulation Mathematical Model and to modify it, as required, in those areas where there is unsatisfactory correlation.

Eight magnetic tapes comprising 90 runs of transient responses and one tape with 16 sets of steady flight test data were supplied by the Army to Sikorsky. These data were made available, under a joint Army/Sikorsky Cooperation Program, for comparison with the BLACK HAWK version of the Sikorsky General Helicopter Flight Dynamics Simulation Program (GEN HEL). The simulation model is programmed on the PDP-K110 computer system. It is identical to the mathematical model, Reference (2), provided to the Army under Contract NAS2-10626 and installed on the NASA Ames Simulation Facility. Computer programs were developed to process the test data and convert them into Sikorsky's Internal Record Acquisition (IRA) format and to edit the resulting data files. An existing program (RAPID) was then utilized to drive the BLACK HAWK simulation model with the flight test cockpit control inputs. The resulting computer generated variables were then stored in data files by means of another program, SAVRUN. These variables and corresponding test data were plotted simultaneously, for comparison, by means of the plotting program, MUPLOT. These programs were previously developed under Sikorsky's IRD funding.

In Reference (1) it was pointed out that the intent of the program was to obtain data solely for the purpose of validating the BLACK HAWK mathematical model. Compliance with this objective resulted in flying the aircraft in a highly degraded operating mode. Thus, the test data cannot be considered representative of the UH-60A in a normal operating condition. The object of this study is to determine how well the mathematical model simulates the aircraft and what can be done to improve the model. The mathematical model is solely of interest here. For these reasons, comments on the flying qualities of the UH-60A are inappropriate and scrupulously avoided and no inferences are drawn.

The validation and update of the BLACK HAWK simulation model are presented in the main body of this report and pertinent modified equations are listed in the appendices.

BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL UPDATE

The procedure followed to update the BLACK HAWK engineering simulation model is as follows:

- Validate simulation fidelity by comparing model calculated data with test data.
- Identify unsatisfactory comparison areas.
- Formulate model revisions which have potential for improving correlation.
- Evaluate revised model formulations.
- Identify revisions appropriate for upgrading the simulation model.

Each of these steps is discussed successively in the following sections of this report.

1.0 SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION

The BLACK HAWK engineering simulation mathematical model is defined in Reference (2). It was validated by comparing model calculated data with flight test data for transient responses to control inputs and for helicopter attitudes and cockpit control positions in trimmed steady flight. Simulation of the flight test runs included the following test conditions:

- Pitch Bias Actuator (PBA) - Disabled and Centered
- Flight Path Stabilization (FPS) - Off
- Trim System - Off
- Stability Augmentation System (SAS)
 - Transient Response - Off
 - Steady Flight - On
- Stabilator Angle - Fixed
 - Transient Response - Flight Test Value
 - Steady Flight - Calculated Trim Value

The locations of the acceleration and velocity sensors are listed in Table I.

The transient responses supplied to Sikorsky consisted primarily of one-half inch and one-inch step and pulse inputs in both directions for each of the four cockpit controls. Some runs also included doublet inputs. The flight conditions included: Forward (351 in.) and Aft (359 in.) CG in hover and 100 knots; and Forward (351) CG at 60 and 120-147 knots. The mechanization of the transient response

comparisons between flight test and the mathematical model was designed to provide the highest possible confidence in the validation. The edited flight test data provided to Sikorsky on magnetic tape were reformatted and stored in the PDP-KL10 computer memory. Test data for the pilot control inputs were separated and used as input drivers to the BLACK HAWK Simulation Model, Reference (2), for the data burst time span. The model was first trimmed to the flight conditions of the test run. The initial condition errors on the controls were then synchronized at $T = 0$ so that the incremental difference was being utilized to excite the simulation. In this way, initial condition errors in control position did not influence the transient response. Of sole importance, then, is the movements of the controls and these were duplicated precisely. Each simulation transient response was stored in computer memory on a data file for subsequent overlay plotting with the test data. This approach permitted a critical and direct comparison between flight and simulation time histories of up to 32 parameters. These comparison plots were then assessed qualitatively for simulation fidelity. By comparing several input magnitudes and directions of the same control for the same flight condition, the effects of contaminations, such as control hysteresis and gusts, on the assessment were minimized when viewed in terms of the consistency of discrepancies. It should be noted that in order to preserve the flight test data base, no attempt was made to alter the test data. Biases, such as those indicated by steady non-zero accelerations with corresponding zero rates, were left intact. The results of this review are summarized in Table II-1 to II-5 and selected demonstration plots are presented in Figures 1 to 8 for discussion in the next section. A discussion of the steady flight data comparison follows in the subsequent section.

1.1

Transient Response Data Comparison

It is not realistic to critique, in detail, 90 transient response comparisons. The following discussion, then, is an analysis of those which typify the general characteristic responses. From a qualitative assessment of the transient response comparison plots, it is concluded that the BLACK HAWK simulation model is a satisfactory engineering design and evaluation tool. In general, the short term response to control inputs compare well which indicates a good definition of control power. In the long term, errors do build up but the trends compare favorably with test data. This is demonstrated by the comparison data in Figures 1 to 8. All of the responses are considered acceptable. Some, however, are classified as acceptable but unsatisfactory. Those which require further improvement are identified in the following sub-sections which discuss responses to each control input. Note in Figures 1 to 8 that the model calculated data are represented by a solid line with "SAV" identified. Test data "TST" are represented by dotted lines.

1.1.1

Response to Longitudinal Stick Input

The calculated response to a one-inch forward longitudinal stick step input (and recovery) at 100 Kn compares favorably with test data as shown in Figures 1a to 1h. Pitching motions during the step input are acceptable, Figure 1a. The large (4 in.) input during recovery, however, generates a higher nose-up acceleration peak for the model (solid line in the figure). This characteristic - large control inputs produce larger calculated responses - is evident in all of the data reviewed. This discrepancy is attributed to the simplified second-order system simulation of the flight control system dynamic characteristics. The actual control system apparently exhibits nonlinear frequency response characteristics which may be characterized by a reduced bandwidth with large amplitude control inputs.

The coupled roll motion also compares favorably with test data, Figure 1b. Coupled yaw motion agrees well during the step input, up to 4 seconds in Figure 1c. However, during the large input recovery, a short (3 second) period oscillation is induced in aircraft yaw rate and heading. The difference in directional response between model and test is considered acceptable but unsatisfactory. This is also true of: lateral velocity, Figure 1d, the associated sideslip angle, Figure 1e, and lateral translational acceleration, Figures 1f and 1h. Thus, the lateral/directional response (exhibited during the recovery) calculated by the model is acceptable but requires improvement. Model longitudinal and vertical translation motion as well as engine and rotor responses calculated by the model, on the other hand, show good agreement with test, Figures 1d to 1h.

1.1.2

Response to Lateral Stick Input

Comparison of responses to a doublet control input is an effective means of evaluating simulation fidelity. The doublet input profile with control reversals permits evaluation of control power, damping, and free-response. The calculated response to a one-inch lateral cyclic stick doublet, shown in Figures 2a to 2d, agree favorably with flight test data in high speed flight, 144 knots. Roll control power and damping are simulated reasonably well, Figure 2a. The cross-coupling effects of the lateral stick input on pitching motion is weaker on the model, however, for the initial right-stick motion, Figure 2b. The aircraft tends to pitch nose-down, whereas model pitch attitude remains stationary. The nose-up coupling with the left stick segment (which is simulated in magnitude but lagged) causes the model to drift nose-up relative to the aircraft. As a result, the aft-stick recovery action by the pilot is opposite to the model requirement so that the model pitches further nose-up. Typically, the two-inch longitudinal control recovery input generates a comparable, but slightly stronger, pitch response on the model. As with longitudinal coupling, lateral/directional coupling with the

lateral stick doublet is predicted weaker by the model. Although yaw coupling is simulated reasonably well both in period and magnitude, Figure 2c, calculated sideslip is relatively benign, Figure 2d. These small differences in cross-coupling with lateral stick between model and test might be reduced by adding (neglected) product of inertia terms to the equations of motion and thereby improving the model lateral/directional characteristics.

1.1.3

Response to Collective Stick Input

Although some of the test data are "noisy", the calculated response, in hover, to a one-inch down collective step input is considered acceptable, Figures 3a to 3d. In particular, predicted vertical and longitudinal accelerations, Figure 3d, match closely test data. Unsatisfactory responses, however, include blade lag angle in Figure 3b; rotor speed, gas governor speed, fuel flow, and engine torque in Figure 3c; and main rotor torque in Figure 3d. These variables are too responsive compared to flight test data. The simulated fuel flow variation with collective stick input is clearly too strong. This indicates that the frequency response bandwidth of the engine model is evidently too wide. Since the engine and the rotor are coupled, the unsatisfactory engine response will affect the rotor, notably rotor speed and blade lag angle. Coupling of fuel-flow with collective, in the load demand system of the engine, therefore is an area of the simulation model that requires improvement.

1.1.4

Response to Pedal Input

Predicted aircraft response to a one-half inch right pedal step input at 144 knots is acceptable, Figures 4a to 4d. Predicted yaw response trends compare reasonably well with test, Figure 4a, and longitudinal coupling correlates quite closely in spite of the longitudinal stick motion, Figure 4b. Roll coupling with pedals, however, is considered acceptable but unsatisfactory. The aircraft roll response is subdued with virtually no adverse roll with pedals, Figure 4c. The model, on the other hand, predicts more roll coupling and response. This is also true for sideslip angle, Figure 4d. Lateral/directional characteristics of the simulation in high speed flight therefore require improvement.

1.1.5

Additional Responses

Four additional response comparisons are presented in Figures 5 to 8 to demonstrate particular aspects of the simulation model validation. In high speed flight, longitudinal coupling with pedal input was predicted with reasonable accuracy, Figure 4b. In hover, however, model pitching motion is similar to the aircraft but opposite in direction, Figures 5a and 5b. The one-half inch left pedal input

generates an increase in tail rotor thrust. Because of the upward tail rotor tilt, the additional thrust generates a nose-down pitching moment. However, main rotor longitudinal control is coupled with pedals to minimize this pitching motion tendency. The compensating coupling simulated in the model is apparently stronger than rigged on the aircraft.

In addition to the nonlinear frequency response characteristics discussed earlier, the aircraft control system also exhibits a control free-play nonlinearity which is demonstrated in Figure 6. A quarter-inch longitudinal stick aft-step input did not generate a response from the aircraft whereas the model did respond to the analytical input. Modelling of this control free-play nonlinearity is judged to be beyond the scope of this update effort.

On both the simulator and the aircraft, the BLACK HAWK is generally flown with, at least, SAS engaged. Accordingly, pertinent responses to longitudinal and collective inputs are presented in Figures 7 and 8 to validate model fidelity with SAS engaged. The calculated responses to a half-inch aft longitudinal stick input at 122 knots follow test data closely. A slightly higher pitch damping in the model, however, produces a smaller steady pitch rate. The correlation is good.

Calculated cockpit vertical acceleration in response to a half-inch up-collective step input with SAS-On at 140 knots also agrees with flight test, Figure 8. The apparent lag in the calculated acceleration response as well as the 2.8 HZ frequency are caused by the plotting program. This will be discussed later. In general, then, simulation fidelity in the longitudinal axis with SAS engaged is good.

1.2

Transient Response Comparison Summary

Typical responses to control inputs for various flight conditions were discussed in detail above. A general, qualitative assessment of the BLACK HAWK simulation model fidelity is summarized in Tables II-1 to II-5 for each airspeed which encompasses all the 90 time histories made available to Sikorsky. Control power and damping for each degree of freedom of the model are classified as weak(er) or strong(er) than the aircraft. Potential areas for improvement are identified as unsatisfactory. These are further summarized as follows:

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

1. Fuel Flow
 - Response with collective input too strong
2. Blade Lagging Angle
 - Steady and vibratory amplitudes are too small
 - Response to collective inputs are too rapid, 0.3 seconds to steady state calculated versus 1.5 seconds for aircraft
3. Main Rotor Torque
 - Response to collective inputs too rapid, 0.3 seconds vs. 1.5 seconds test
 - Affects yaw and roll adversely with collective inputs
4. Inertia Coupling
 - Inertia cross-coupling is approximate
5. Damping
 - Fuselage damping is ignored which could affect unstable roots
6. Control Cross-Coupling
 - Strong adverse roll with pedals
 - Wrong signs (adverse)
 - Roll with longitudinal stick
 - Roll with collective stick
 - Pitch with lateral stick
 - Pitch with Pedals
 - Yaw with longitudinal stick
 - Yaw with collective
7. Control System Dynamics - Control Free-Play
 - Small control inputs produce a model response but no aircraft response due to control free-play.
 - Large (3 inch) and rapid inputs produce larger calculated response

8. Acceleration Responses

- Evidence of 2.8, 7.8, and 16 Hz frequencies, particularly roll acceleration
- Lag in vertical acceleration with collective input, SAS-On.

1.3

Steady Flight Data Comparison

Steady trimmed flight with SAS engaged was simulated on the computer model for the following flight conditions:

- Airspeed sweep - hover to 160 knots.
- Lateral/directional static stability 60, 100, 140 Kn.
- Longitudinal static stability - 60, 100, 137.5 Kn.
- Climbs and descents - 60, 100, 137.5 Kn.
- Steady left and right turns - 60, 100 Kn.
- Rotor speed sweep - 60, 100, 137.5 Kn.
- Stabilator angle sweep - 60, 100, 137.5 Kn.

The calculated results are compared with flight test data in Figures 9 to 18 and discussed in the following sections.

1.3.1

Airspeed Sweep

Data for level flight static trim for airspeeds from hover to 160 knots are compared in Figure 9. Data for the modified model are also shown. These will be discussed later. The data for the original model (now at NASA) show good agreement with test, except for pedal position and stabilator incidence angle, Figures 9b and 9c. During extensive flight tests of the BLACK HAWK at Sikorsky, stabilator angle never exceeded 40° in low-speed flight. The AEFA flight tests, however, recorded values as high as 45°. Furthermore, since calculated pitch attitude agrees with test, it is concluded that the test values are in error. This is corroborated by the data shown in Figure 10. With tail incidence (stabilator angle) held fixed at the test value, calculated pitch attitude and longitudinal stick position differ considerably from test data. Since the test values for stabilator angle are in suspect, all of the subsequent steady flight trim data were generated using the calculated values. Unless the aircraft tail rotor rigging is not within specifications, the difference in pedal position, Figure 9b, is due to the model. This difference, more than 10%, is unsatisfactory and needs improvement.

1.3.2

Lateral/Directional Static Stability

Comparisons between the predicted and test lateral/directional characteristics for 60, 100, and 140 knots are shown in Figures 11, 12, and 13 respectively. As with the airspeed sweep, pedal position shows least agreement with test. At 60 knots, the aircraft is flying on the back side of the power required curve. It is difficult, therefore, for the pilot to maintain trimmed flight for an extended (data taking) period of time. For this reason predicted roll angles, Figure 11a, and pitch attitudes, Figure 11b are considered acceptable and well within test data accuracy. Although lateral stick, Figure 11a, and collective, Figure 11b, show very good agreement with test, predicted longitudinal stick is about 5% aft relative to test data. This is acceptable and probably due to main rotor downwash impinging on the horizontal tail. The main rotor wake simulation in the model is considered adequate.

At 100 knots, the low horizontal tail is clear of the main rotor wake so that the predicted longitudinal characteristics in sideslip flight agree closely with test, Figure 12b. Also, at this speed flight test roll angle is more definitive with sideslip, Figure 12a. As a result, roll correlation improves with only a slight affect on lateral stick comparison. Pedal position, however, remains acceptable but unsatisfactory. This is also true for sideslip flight at 140 knots, Figure 13. Roll angle prediction agrees well with test but lateral stick compares less favorably than at lower speeds. Lateral/directional characteristics of the model in high speed flight, then, should be improved. This is consistent with the transient roll response with pedal input comparison discussed previously.

1.3.3

Longitudinal Static Stability

Comparison data for collective-fixed longitudinal static stability at 60, 100, and 137.5 knots are presented in Figure 14. Of primary interest here is the slope of the flight variables as speed is varied about the trim point. The data in Figures 14a and 14b show, in that context, that the simulation model will predict the longitudinal static stability characteristics with good accuracy. Although model pedal position is consistently right about 5%, the gradient with speed conforms with flight test. Overall, the correlation is considered good.

1.3.4

Steady Climbs and Descents

Calculated and test comparison data for steady climbs and descents at 60, 100, and 137.5 knots are presented in Figures 15a, b, and c respectively. Stabilator angle is held fixed at the calculated level

flight (no climb) trim value for each speed. At 60 knots, simulation of the main rotor wake impinging on the horizontal tail is approximate. This is evident by the difference between the test and calculated values for pitch attitude and longitudinal stick position, Figure 15a. Correlation of these variables, however, is considered acceptable. Although collective, main rotor power and lateral stick are predicted with better accuracy, pedal position comparison is unsatisfactory.

Typically, at the higher airspeeds, 100 and 137.5 knots, pitch attitude and longitudinal stick correlation improve, Figures 15b and 15c. Collective stick, main rotor power and lateral stick correlations are also good at these speeds within the scatter of the test data.

1.3.5

Steady Turns

Flight test data were supplied by the Army for steady turns at 60 and 100 knots. These data are compared with model calculated data in Figure 16. Flight variables are plotted in parallel for each speed as a function of roll angle, the independent variable. The calculated data for all variables shown, except pitch attitude and longitudinal stick, correlate very well with test data. As has been discussed previously, main rotor downwash and stabilator setting have a strong effect on pitch attitude and longitudinal stick position at low airspeeds. This effect is also evident in the difference between the test and calculated values of these variables. The difference is considered small and acceptable. Model prediction for turning flight, then, is considered quite good.

1.3.6

Rotor Speed Sweep

Main rotor rotational speed (N_r) was varied from 95% to 105% (100% = 27 rad/sec) in the simulation model. The calculated results are compared with flight test data for 60, 100, and 137.5 knots in Figure 17. Stabilator angle was held fixed at the 100% N_r value. As shown in the figure, the simulation model predicts quite well the variation of the flight variables with rotor speed. As in turning flight above, main rotor power, collective stick and lateral stick position calculated data correlate well with test data. Pitch attitude, longitudinal stick and pedal position predicted data are offset from the flight data. At 137.5 knots, however, longitudinal stick position shows good agreement in both magnitude and slope; and pitch attitude is acceptable within test data scatter, Figure 17a. Although calculated main rotor power is slightly higher than test at this speed, Figure 17b, the difference is attributed to the test data. Note that calculated main rotor power correlated quite closely with test data at 137.5 knots during the airspeed sweep, Figure 9c. Overall, then, the simulation model predicts the effects of rotor speed variation with acceptable accuracy.

1.3.7

Stabilator Angle Sweep

Calculated stabilator angle did not agree with the flight test values for the airspeed sweep, Figure 9c. It was demonstrated in Figure 10 that by using the flight test value of stabilator angle, calculated pitch attitude and longitudinal position were in error during a sideslip angle sweep at 60 knots. This is also demonstrated by the stabilator angle sweep data at 60, 100, and 137.5 knots, Figure 18. Stabilator position has a significant effect on only pitch attitude and longitudinal stick position. Accordingly, these variables are plotted in Figures 18a and 18b respectively. At the higher airspeeds, 100 and 137.5 knots, test values of stabilator position have a fixed bias, leading edge up, of about 3 degrees. At 60 knots, main rotor wake effects, actual and simulated, cause a less-uniform difference between the data. This is consistent with the previous flight variable sweeps discussed above. Calculated pitch attitude and longitudinal stick position comparison with test is consistently better in high speed flight than at 60 knots. This is also evident in the data comparison in Figure 18. The slope of these variables compare better with test data at the higher airspeeds. The slope comparison also verifies that aeroelastic deflection (if any) does not have a significant effect on aircraft pitch attitude and longitudinal control position. At these speeds, at least, a rigid stabilator simulation is acceptable.

1.4

Steady Flight Comparison Summary

In general, the BLACK HAWK simulation model predicts steady flight trim characteristics with good accuracy. Flight test values for stabilator position appear to have a bias of about 3°. The model was therefore validated, with good results, using the predicted stabilator settings. The effects of the rotor wake on the fuselage and stabilator are accounted for by downwash correction terms in the existing model. These terms provided favorable correlation of pitch attitude and longitudinal stick position at the higher airspeeds. Several areas, primarily in lateral/directional static stability, however, could be improved. These, which could also affect transient response, include:

- Pedal variation in forward flight and sideslip.
- Roll angle with sideslip.
- Cyclic stick and pedal position with sideslip.

2.0

SIMULATION MODEL UPDATE

2.1

Potential Approaches

In Sections 1.2 and 1.4, correlation areas that were acceptable but unsatisfactory were delineated. Potential approaches to improve the BLACK HAWK simulation model in these areas have been formulated and include the following with identification figures:

- Revise fuel flow coupling with collective stick to improve engine response, Figure 3c.
- Incorporate updated formulation of cross-coupling inertia terms to improve adverse roll and roll response with pedal input, Figure 4.
- Revise downwash correction terms to improve pedal position correlation in sideslip flight, Figures 11 to 13.
- Incorporate first order lag in rotor simulation to improve main rotor torque and blade lag angle response to collective stick inputs, Figures 3b and 3d.
- Introduce tail rotor downwash lag and fuselage damping to improve high speed transient response, Figure 4.
- Investigate source of 2.8, 7.8, and 16 Hz frequencies in acceleration responses, Figures 1b and 3d, and 0.05 sec lag in vertical acceleration response to collective input, Figure 8.

Evaluations of these approaches, discussed below, are centered on collective/fuel flow coupling in hover and high speed lateral directional characteristics. In Figure 19 through 32, the modified model data are represented by solid lines; existing model data are shown as dashed lines; and test data "TST" are expressed as dotted lines.

2.2

Evaluation of Model Revisions

2.2.1

Collective/Fuel-Flow Coupling In Hover

The frequency response bandwidth of the engine simulation is too wide. This is evident by the engine variables responses to a collective stick step input in hover, Figure 19. In particular, fuel flow response is too rapid. As a result, both rotor speed and yaw acceleration calculated response to the input are opposite to the aircraft response, Figure 19a and 19b.

In the engine simulation, gas governor speed is controlled by fuel flow. In order to anticipate the power changes associated with collective stick motion, fuel flow is coupled with collective through the Load Demand Spindle (LDS). Fuel flow is controlled, in part, by the output of the load demand spindle cam. The cam is rotated, through a static droop compensator, by a bell crank in the collective mechanical flight control system. The aircraft system, however, also includes fuel metering lags and nonlinearities such as hysteresis and control free-play in the LDS system.

In order to account for these effects without undue complexity, a first-order lag was incorporated at the output of the load demand spindle cam.

$$LDS \text{ (new)} = LDS \text{ (old)} * (1/(TS+1))$$

A significant improvement in correlation with test was obtained with a time constant, $T = 0.75$ seconds, as shown in Figure 20. Some of the improvements include:

- Initial rotor speed and yaw acceleration response to collective are now in the proper direction.
- Main rotor blade lag angle and torque as well as all engine variables have rise times comparable to test data.

The sharp increase in calculated fuel flow at 2 seconds, Figure 20a, is attributed to simplifications in the Electrical Control Unit (ECU) of the linear engine simulation model. Since the fuel flow increase does not significantly affect helicopter response, it is considered acceptable. Therefore, all unsatisfactory areas associated with collective stick inputs will be eliminated by incorporating a first order lag with a 0.75 second time constant at the output of the load demand system spindle cam of the model. To do this, the equation for load demand spindle output on Page 5.6-11 of Reference (2) is changed to read as follows:

$$NGGLDS = f(LDSCAM, XC) * (1/((TXC)S + 1))$$

where $TXC = 0.75$

2.2.2 High Speed Lateral/Directional Response

2.2.2.1 Main Rotor Yaw Moment

In high speed flight (140 knots) main rotor torque is high. It is also a principal contributor to the yaw moment equation. In the rotor module, Page 5.1-36 of Reference (2), yaw moment of the main rotor is defined in terms of engine torque, QHEG. The only torque,

about the vertical axis, reacted by the fuselage is main rotor torque, QHMR. Therefore, QHEG should be replaced by QHMR in the transformation matrix. Although this change should be incorporated into the model, its implementation had no substantial effect on helicopter response to a pedal input in high speed flight, Figure 21. A check on response to a collective input in hover, Figure 22, also indicates no substantial effect on helicopter or engine response. In hover and high speed flight, for the conditions tested, the engine governor matches power available (engine torque) with power required (rotor torque) quite closely.

2.2.2.2.2 Main Rotor Downwash Correction

From analysis of rotor-on wind tunnel data and UH-60A flight test data, Sikorsky developed downwash correction terms to the applied aerodynamic forces to account for main rotor wake swirl impinging on the empennage. These are programmed in the simulation model and are listed on Page 5.10-19 of Reference (2). Some of these terms were modified as an approach to improving the model lateral directional characteristics.

As an initial step, however, formulations for the flight control system and control coupling in the simulation model were verified to ensure that they conform with specified rigging data. Secondly, the tail rotor control simulation and aircraft rigging were compared with Sikorsky specifications. Tail rotor rigging data, Figure 23, verify that the test aircraft was rigged to specifications. Also, the simulation provides an acceptable linear model of tail rotor coupling with main rotor collective.

With the control system validated, the downwash correction equations were then modified to improve correlation of lateral stick and pedals in sideslip flight at 140 knots, Figure 13a. The modified equations are listed in Appendix I. The results obtained by implementing these modifications, as well as incorporating main rotor torque in the yaw equation, are shown on Figure 13 as dashed lines. Introduction of a new yaw moment correction term and revision of the roll moment with sideslip terms were effective in improving correlation of lateral stick and pedals. Since the data were "force-fit" at 140 knots and since the force and moment corrections are functions of dynamic pressure, the modifications were evaluated at the lower airspeeds.

The improved correlation of lateral stick and pedals with test was maintained at 100 knots, Figure 12a. Although the slope of roll angle with sideslip was increased slightly, predicted roll angle is considered acceptable and is within the accuracy of the test data. At 60 knots, Figure 11a, dynamic pressure is low and the effects of the modification on the lateral/directional characteristics are small. This is also true for the two longitudinal parameters, pitch attitude and longitudinal stick, at both speeds, Figures 11b and 12b.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

The effect of dynamic pressure is also evident in the level flight static trim data shown in Figures 9a to 9c. Pedal position now compares favorably with the aircraft data at high speeds. Longitudinal stick and pitch attitude comparison are also improved. The associated increase in right stick is not considered significant.

The transient response to a pedal input in high speed flight is also improved by the modified downwash correction terms, Figure 24. Peak roll rate and roll angle are more than halved with no degradation in pitching motion. Yaw motion and sideslip are also reduced and match flight test data in the short term. Introduction of these empirical downwash correction modifications, then, can improve the simulation model fidelity, particularly in high speed flight.

2.2.2.3 Tail Rotor Downwash Lag

Tail rotor thrust is a significant contributor to helicopter lateral/directional characteristics. A potential approach to improving adverse roll and subsequent roll motion following a pedal input is to incorporate aerodynamic lag in development of tail rotor downwash. Accordingly, a first order lag was introduced into the tail rotor equations similar to the main rotor. The equation for tail rotor downwash on Page 5.4-7 of Reference (3) was modified to read:

$$DWSHTR = f(MUZTR, THETTR, etc) * (1/((TDW) S + 1))$$

Where TDW = tail rotor downwash lag time constant. As shown in Figure 25a, a time constant of 0.050 seconds was effective in improving the initial yaw acceleration and rate response to the pedal input. Its effect on the long term response, however, is negligible, Figure 25b. Tail rotor downwash and thrust did not vary appreciably during the roll and yaw motion. The tail rotor, then, did not participate significantly in the helicopter motion associated with the pedal push and hold input at 140 knots. In particular, tail rotor downwash lag has a negligible effect on roll reversal accompanying the initial pedal motion.

2.2.2.4 Tail Rotor Downwash on Vertical Tail

Interaction between the tail rotor and vertical tail is incorporated in the simulation in the form of tail rotor blockage. This is shown on Page 5.4-8 of Reference (2). Below 30 knots (VBVTR), tail rotor downwash generates a sideforce (download) on the vertical tail opposite to tail rotor thrust. The net effect is an apparent reduction in tail rotor thrust. Above 30 knots, the tail rotor download is considered negligible so that the net force is due entirely to tail rotor thrust.

Since the tail rotor is only 14 inches from the vertical tail, tail rotor downwash could influence the flow field at the vertical tail, even in high speed flight. At the higher airspeeds, a small change in vertical tail angle of attack (sideslip) induced by tail rotor downwash can produce a measurable side force and thereby influence lateral/directional characteristics of the helicopter.

This interactional aerodynamic effect between the vertical tail and tail rotor in forward flight can be incorporated in the model by means of a tail rotor downwash interference velocity on the vertical tail. It is added to the generalized interference velocity term $VYIV1$ on Page 5.3-11 of Reference (2). It is defined, similar to main rotor downwash interference velocity, as:

$$VYTRV1 = EKTRVT * DWSHTR * OMEGTR * RTR$$

where $EKTRVT$ is the tail-rotor downwash coefficient. A value of 1.2 was selected for evaluation. Thus, the interference velocity at the vertical tail is assumed to be 1.2 times the downwash velocity at the tail rotor center.

As shown in Figure 26, introduction of tail rotor downwash interference on the vertical tail does not appreciably alter the helicopter response to a pedal input. It primarily influences static trim characteristics. Before its introduction, Figure 25, trim pedal position compared closely with test. After its introduction, calculated trim pedal position shifted to the left about one-half inch, Figure 26.

The primary change in tail rotor downwash occurs in the short term during the pedal input. In the first second following this input, tail rotor interference reduced yaw rate response to improve correlation. Pitch rate response, however, was also reduced and correlation was not improved, Figure 26. In the long term, as discussed above, tail rotor downwash does not vary appreciably. Its interaction with the vertical tail, then, will not significantly affect the long term transient response when pedals are held fixed. Sideslip angle is more important than tail rotor downwash on vertical tail angle of attack.

2.2.2.5 Horizontal Tail Roll Damping

The large (30 ft/sec) peak roll rate predicted by the existing model indicates a potential deficiency in roll damping. The rotor, horizontal tail, and vertical tail all contribute to roll damping, with the main contribution coming from the rotor. Although the horizontal tail contribution from conventional tails is small and often neglected, unusually large horizontal tails can provide significant roll damping. Since the UH-60A horizontal tail is relatively large (14.38 ft. span), it might be providing measurable damping on the aircraft.

Roll rate is used to calculate local velocity and angle of attack at the horizontal tail in the simulation model. However, the tail aerodynamic center is located in the plane of symmetry (BLHT = 0) so that roll rate does not directly produce a roll moment. A separate equation for horizontal tail roll moment due to roll rate was developed using the UH-60A geometry and Section 7.1.2.2 of Reference (3). The resulting roll damping derivative was reduced to the following equation:

$$LPLADD = (-1606) * (QFRE/VXB) * p$$

which was programmed in the downwash correction module. The transient response to the pedal input was then calculated and the results are compared in Figure 27. Tail rotor interference was not included in this calculation run. However, the revised main rotor downwash correction terms, which were included, reduced the roll response so that the horizontal tail contribution to roll damping is negligibly small. A comparison of Figure 27 with 25b shows no significant difference. It was reasonable, then, to neglect the horizontal tail roll damping during the simulation model development. Its potential for improving the simulation model is negligible.

2.2.2.6 Updated Product of Inertia Terms

Implicit in the equations of motion in the existing model, Page 5.10-6 of Reference (2), is the assumption that the helicopter center of gravity is in the plane of symmetry. This is a reasonable assumption for a symmetrically loaded UH-60A. On the test aircraft lateral CG offset was less than 0.25 inches. For asymmetrical loads, ejection of an auxiliary tip tank for example, this assumption is invalid.

The existing moment equations permit a tilt of the X-Z principal inertial axes relative to the corresponding body axes by including the product of inertia Ixz. Lateral tilt is ignored by the assumption that Ixy and Iyz products of inertia are both zero. This simplification reduces the coupling of the moment equations of motion and reduces simulation computing time with no significant loss of accuracy.

Since the UH-60A is flown, as a minimum, with SAS engaged, the transient responses to gusts and control inputs are mild, Figures 7 and 8. The angular rates are small and their products are not significant. Product of inertia terms, then, have a negligible effect on the transient response, SAS-On. With SAS disengaged, however, large transient rates can be developed so that inertia coupling may be significant.

An updated formulation of the equations of motion which includes all of the product of inertia terms was recently developed by Sikorsky Aircraft. These fully-coupled equations are listed in Appendix II. The simulation was revised to incorporate these equations with the following representative product of inertia values (in slug-ft² units):

IXZ = 1882.0	(no change)
IXY = - 213.0	(added)
IYZ = - 66.0	(added)

The transient response to the pedal input was then calculated and the comparative results are shown in Figure 28. All modifications discussed above were retained except for horizontal tail roll damping. The additional products of inertia IXY and IYZ are small (CG offset was assumed zero) and the angular rates are relatively small so that no significant inertial coupling occurs in this transient response. For this symmetrical loading application, then, the existing simulation model is adequate. As a general purpose engineering simulation model, however, it is limited because it cannot be used for asymmetric loading applications.

The revised inertia coupling did not appreciably affect the calculated adverse roll during the pedal input, Figure 28. The benign response measured on the aircraft may be indicative of a steeper tilt of X-Z inertial axes so that the X inertial axis passes closer to the tail rotor. Accordingly, the product inertia IXZ was increased 50% from 1882.0 to 2823.0. Even with this new value, the simulation model consistently predicts an adverse roll, Figure 29. Also, the increased IXZ value did not significantly alter the overall transient response. In this instance, then, tilt of the X-Z principal axes of inertia is not a critical mass-property parameter. The angular acceleration and the products of the associated rates are small enough to minimize inertial coupling effects.

The updated formulation of the moment equations of motion did not significantly influence the calculated transient response to a pedal input in high speed flight. However, the revised equations, listed in Appendix II, should be incorporated in the UH-60 engineering simulation model for future use. They will permit simulation of lateral CG offsets which cannot be done with the existing model.

2.2.2.7 Updated Model

A complete updated model was assembled. It includes the following modifications:

- Calculated Stabilator Angle
- Collective LDS Lag
- Main Rotor Torque in Yaw Moment Equation
- Revised Downwash Correction
- Updated Equations of Motion
- Tail Rotor Downwash Lag
- Tail Rotor Downwash on Vertical Tail

The predicted response to the pedal input is compared with test and with the existing model in Figure 30. Correlation is improved, in general, by these modifications, particularly initial yaw rate and all of the roll responses. Peak pitch rate, however, is reduced. Although adverse roll is still strong, the overall predicted helicopter response, on the whole, is considered satisfactory.

As an additional check, the response of the updated model to a pedal pulse input at 100 knots was calculated. A comparison of the results are shown in Figure 31. The improvement in simulation fidelity at this speed is similar to the gains obtained at 144 knots. Although the predicted roll motion is reduced, adverse roll is still strong. The strong calculated roll persists even though the initial yaw response is reduced Figure 31a. Tail rotor downwash interference on the vertical tail is apparently too strong at this speed. The net result is that heading (yaw angle) correlation is not improved Figure 31b. The reduced pitch and roll rates, however, result in favorable comparison of pitch and roll attitude. The primary attribute of the updated model, then, is an improved correlation with test for roll response to a pedal input in high speed forward flight.

2.2.3

Variable Frequencies In Model Acceleration Time Histories

Three frequencies (2.8, 7.8, and 16 Hz) appear in the calculated responses of all accelerations. The 2.8 Hz frequency is clearly evident in roll acceleration, Figure 1b for example. The 2.8 and 7.8 Hz frequencies are fictitious and result from aliasing by the plotting program.

At 100% rotor speed, rotor angular velocity is 27.0 rad/sec so that the one-per-rev (1P) frequency is 4.3 Hz and, with four blades, the b-per-rev (bP) frequency is 17.2 Hz. In-plane harmonic forces in the rotating rotor hub are transmitted to the fuselage as harmonic forces with a steady component and components that are integral multiples of the bP frequency (NbP). Thus, the only high frequency that should appear in the time history plots is on the order of 17.2 Hz, depending on actual rotor speed.

The simulation model was run with a duty cycle of 0.010 seconds. For a nine second run time, 900 points were calculated for each variable. The plotting program, however, is limited to storing a maximum of 300 points per variable. Thus, calculated data points were selectively ignored to compress the data file. As a result, the time interval between data points for the stored (plot) file is longer than the calculated duty cycle. The data for these BLACK HAWK runs were stored with 0.03, 0.04, and 0.05 seconds time intervals, depending on the total run time.

The aliasing equation and Figure 2, both of Reference (4), indicate that the 17.2 Hz frequency can appear as follows:

<u>Time Interval (sec)</u>	<u>Aliased Frequency (Hz)</u>
.03	16.1
.04	7.8
.05	2.8

which correspond to the observed frequencies in the figures. For further proof, the run time for the pedal input transient response at 140 knots was reduced to 3 seconds. The time interval in the resulting plot file matched the computing increment of 0.01 seconds. The corresponding time history plots of angular acceleration, Figure 32a, show that the 17.4 Hz (101% rotor speed) frequency is reproduced correctly. At this high frequency, importantly, the correct accelerations integrate into relatively small rates, Figure 32b. A comparison of the angular rates with and without aliasing, Figures 32B and 30A, shows that aliasing has no significant effect on rates. They were calculated by integrating the "true" bP frequency response. Aliasing, then, is introduced only on the small-amplitude, high frequency component of the plotted rate data.

Calculated vertical acceleration response to a collective input at 140 knots with SAS engaged, Figure 8, has a strong 2.8 Hz frequency and lags test by about 0.05 seconds. In hover, Figure 3d, with SAS off and a 7.8 Hz frequency present, there is no lag. This trend was noted in the other collective responses. Calculated vertical acceleration tends to lag test data when a relatively strong 2.8 Hz frequency is present. The lag in Figure 8, then, is considered to be caused by aliasing in the plotted data. It is not related to SAS or to airspeed.

Of importance is the fact that aliasing effects occur only in the output plotted data and are minimal in rate and attitude data. The test runs were simulated using a 10 millisecond duty cycle which is more than adequate for the fundamental, bP, frequency. For these reasons rate and attitude response data (instead of acceleration) were used to assess simulation model fidelity.

RECOMMENDED MODEL UPDATES

Potential approaches were assessed as means of improving unsatisfactory areas of correlation of the BLACK HAWK simulation model with test data. Although all of the approaches improve the accuracy of the model, some are more effective in improving correlations for the flight conditions investigated. Recommended modifications of the existing model to create a more descriptive and representative simulation for engineering purposes are as follows in their order of priority:

1. Substitute main rotor torque, QHBMR, for engine torque, QHEG, in the main rotor moment matrix.
2. Introduce a first order lag with a 0.75 second time constant at the output of the LDS/collective system of the engine simulation.
3. Update the moment equations of motion to include additional product of inertia terms and lateral CG offset.
4. Introduce a first order lag with a 0.05 second time constant at the calculation of tail rotor downwash, DWSHTR.
5. Modify downwash correction terms.
6. Introduce tail rotor downwash interaction with the vertical tail in forward flight.

Substitution of main rotor torque for engine torque, Item 1, is important for accuracy with the engine engaged (powered flight). With the engine simulation disengaged (autorotation) the existing model correctly uses main rotor torque in the main rotor moment matrix. Introduction of the LDS/collective lag, Item 2, significantly improved the correlation of transient response to collective inputs. These two modifications are simple but important.

The existing equations of motion which use only the IXZ product of inertia are adequate for simulation of symmetrical loading conditions with trivial helicopter CG offsets from the plane of symmetry. The updated equations in Appendix II, Item 3, are applicable to any helicopter and will permit simulation of any loading condition.

The first order lag on tail rotor downwash, Item 4, will improve the short term yaw motion response correlation. For the conditions investigated, tail rotor downwash did not vary appreciably so that the long term (pedals fixed) effects were minimal. This lag is therefore more important in maneuvering flight.

The existing correction terms for main rotor downwash interaction with the empennage were developed from correlation studies with UH-60A BLACK HAWK flight tests conducted at Sikorsky. Correlation of the existing model with the AEFA test data was improved (lateral/directional stability at 140 knots) by modifying some of the terms. Since the correlation forces and moments are functions of dynamic pressure, the improvement gains are small at 60 knots. In high speed flight, 140 knots, the roll response to a pedal input was significantly reduced and improved correlation. The modifications to the downwash correction terms, however, are empirical and are based on the limited AEFA data. For this reason incorporation of Item 5 is given a low priority.

Tail rotor downwash interaction with the vertical tail is simulated in the existing model at low airspeeds (0-30 knots). It can be incorporated for higher airspeeds, Item 6, by introducing an interference velocity on the vertical tail in terms of tail rotor downwash. In high speed flight, 140 knots, trim pedal position, at least, is changed on introduction of this modification. The change in control position indicates that the adequacy of the downwash correction terms, existing and modified, have to be verified. Also, the downwash ratio factor, $EXTRVT = 1.2$, implies a strong deflection or entrainment of the flow field at the vertical tail. Additional studies are required to substantiate this value as well as this method of simulating tail-rotor/vertical-tail interactional effects. For this reason, implementation of this modification, Item 6, is placed last in order of priority.

TABLE I

ACCELERATION AND VELOCITY SENSOR LOCATIONS

USAAEFA Project No. 79-24 Black Hawk S/N 77-22716

Nose Accelerometer (PS2)

FS	178
BL	- 10 (Port)
WL	215

CS Accelerometer (PS3)

FS	389
BL	- 31 (Port)
WL	207.7

Translation Velocity (PS4)

FS	248
BL	70 (St'b'd)
WL	265

TABLE II:
BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL
COMPARISON WITH FLIGHT TEST

AEFA TAPE BHAWK 248

HOVER

<u>DEGREE OF FREEDOM</u>	<u>CONTROL POWER</u>				<u>DAMPING</u>	
	<u>LATERAL CYCLIC</u>	<u>LONG. CYCLIC</u>	<u>PEDALS</u>	<u>COLLECTIVE</u>	<u>PITCH</u>	<u>ROLL</u>
<u>ROLL</u>		<u>US</u> ADVERSE		STRONG		<u>US</u> WEAK
<u>PITCH</u>	<u>US</u> ADVERSE		<u>US</u> ADVERSE	<u>US</u> STRONG	<u>US</u> WEAK	
<u>YAW</u>			WEAK -	<u>US</u> ADVERSE		
<u>LONG.</u>		STRONG	WEAK	STRONG		
<u>LATERAL</u>	WEAK		WEAK			
<u>VERTICAL</u>	STRONG		WEAK			

NOTE: US = UNSATISFACTORY AND NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

TABLE II-
BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL
COMPARISON WITH FLIGHT TEST

AEFA TAPE BHAWK 5

60 KNOTS

<u>DEGREE OF FREEDOM</u>	<u>CONTROL POWER</u>				<u>DAMPING</u>	
	<u>LATERAL CYCLIC</u>	<u>LONG. CYCLIC</u>	<u>PEDALS</u>	<u>COLLECTIVE</u>	<u>PITCH</u>	<u>ROLL</u>
<u>ROLL</u>		<u>US</u> STRONG	<u>US</u> STRONG			
<u>PITCH</u>	<u>US</u> STRONG RECOVERY	<u>US</u> STRONG	<u>US</u> STRONG RECOVERY	<u>US</u> STRONG RECOVERY		
<u>YAW</u>	WEAK	<u>US</u> ADVERSE		ADVERSE		
<u>LONG.</u>		STRONG	STRONG	WEAK		
<u>LATERAL</u>	WEAK		WEAK			
<u>VERTICAL</u>				STRONG		

NOTE: US = UNSATISFACTORY AND NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

TABLE II-
BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL
COMPARISON WITH FLIGHT TEST

AEFA TAPE BHAWK 4&7

100 KNOTS

<u>DEGREE OF FREEDOM</u>	<u>CONTROL POWER</u>				<u>DAMPING</u>	
	<u>LATERAL CYCLIC</u>	<u>LONG CYCLIC</u>	<u>PEDALS</u>	<u>COLLECTIVE</u>	<u>PITCH</u>	<u>ROLL</u>
<u>ROLL</u>			<u>US</u> STRONG			
<u>PITCH</u>	<u>US</u> ADVERSE		<u>US</u> STRONG			
<u>YAW</u>				ADVERSE		
<u>LONG</u>				STRONG		
<u>LATERAL</u>	<u>WEAK</u>	STRONG				
<u>VERTICAL</u>	<u>US</u> PITCH COUPLING		STRONG			

NOTE: US = UNSATISFACTORY AND NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

TABLE II-
BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL
COMPARISON WITH FLIGHT TEST

AEFA TAPE BHAWK 3

-120-140 KNOTS

<u>DEGREE OF FREEDOM</u>	<u>CONTROL POWER</u>					<u>DAMPING</u>	
	<u>LATERAL CYCLIC</u>	<u>LONG CYCLIC</u>	<u>PEDALS</u>	<u>COLLECTIVE</u>		<u>PITCH</u>	<u>ROLL</u>
<u>ROLL</u>	US STRONG LARGE INPUTS	US STRONG	US STRONG ADVERSE - ROLL	US ADVERSE (QMR)			<u>WEAK</u>
<u>PITCH</u>	ADVERSE	STRONG		US WEAK		STRONG	
<u>YAW</u>	WEAK	US ADVERSE	US WEAK @120 STRONG @140	US ADVERSE (QMR)			
<u>LONG.</u>		STRONG RECOVERY		WEAK			
<u>LATERAL</u>	WEAK						
<u>VERTICAL</u>		WEAK					

NOTE: US = UNSATISFACTORY AND NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

TABLE II-
BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL
COMPARISON WITH FLIGHT TEST

AEFA TAPE BHAWK 6

145-150 KNOTS

<u>DEGREE OF FREEDOM</u>	<u>CONTROL POWER</u>					<u>DAMPING</u>	
	<u>LATERAL CYCLIC</u>	<u>LONG CYCLIC</u>	<u>PEDALS</u>	<u>COLLECTIVE</u>		<u>PITCH</u>	<u>ROLL</u>
<u>ROLL</u>		<u>US</u> STRONG RECOVERY	<u>US</u> STRONG ADVERSE ROLL	STRONG (QMR)			
<u>PITCH</u>	<u>US</u> STRONG	<u>US</u> STRONG QMR RETURN		<u>US</u> WEAK			
<u>YAW</u>	WEAK	WEAK	WEAK-LT STRONG-RT	ADVERSE (QMR)			
<u>LONG.</u>				WEAK			
<u>LATERAL</u>	WEAK						
<u>VERTICAL</u>		<u>US</u> WEAK IN PULL					

NOTE: US = UNSATISFACTORY AND NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 1a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY

8-DEC-82

13:07

(1/8)

REFR TEST TAPE BRAWK4 8/18/82

FLY USA RUN 17 100KTS LONG. INPUT


VKT	99.998644	HEIGHT	16480.000	FSCG	359.59999	IMI	7.8999999
XR	5.2525152	XB	4.1225774	XC	4.885791	XP	3.0781338
THETAB	.452576E-1	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0037036	GGAPM	89.872973

Calculated

Test


----- THETAB SAV402

----- THETAB TST402




----- QDEG SAV402

----- QDEG TST402




----- QDOT SAV402

----- QDOT TST402



----- XB SAV402

----- XB TST402



SA 111

9a 13
10-DEC
TST402
PCD
SAV402
.DOT

Figure 1b

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
 REFA TEST TAPE BRAHMK4 8/18/82
 FLT 45A RUN 17 100KTS LONG. INPUT

8-DEC-82 13:07

(2/8)





YKT	99.998644	HEIGHT	16480.000	FSCG	359.59999	IM1	7.8999999
XB	5.2525152	XB	4.1228774	YC	4.8625791	XP	3.0781338
THETAB	.452576E-1	PHIB	0.	CHGRAT	1.0037036	CGRPM	89.872973

Calculated

----- PHIB SAV402

Test

----- PHIB TST402



SA 1114

19-13
 10-DEC
 TST402
 .PCD
 SAV402
 .DAT

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 1c

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
REFR TEST TAPE BRAHMK4 8/18/82
FLT 4SA RUN 17 100KTS LONG. INPUT

8-DEC-82 13:07

(3/8)


VKT	99.998644	WEIGHT	16480.000	FSCG	359.59999	IHI	7.8999999
XB	5.2525152	XB	4.1226774	CMGRAT	4.8625791	XP	3.0781338
THETAB	.452576E-1	PHIB	0.		1.0037036	GGAPW	89.872973

Calculated

Test


PSIB SAV402

TST402




ROEG SAV402

TST402




ROBT SAV402

TST402



XP SAV402

TST402



SA 1111


194:3
10-DEC
TST402
ROEG
SAV402
ROBT

Figure 1d

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
 REFR TEST TAPE 8HAWK4 3/18/82
 FLT 4SA RUN 17 100KTS LONG. INPUT

VKT 99.998644 WEIGHT 16480.000 FSCG 359.59999 IH1 7.8999999
 XA 5.2525152 XB 4.1226774 XC 4.8625791 XP 3.0781338
 THETAB .4525762-1 PHIB 0.0037036 OMGRAT 1.0037036 GCRPM 89.872973

(4/8)



SA 1114

154 13
 10-DEC
 TST402
 VPS4
 SAV402
 .END

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 1e

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 8-DEC-82 13:07 (5/8)
REFA TEST TAPE BHAWK4 9/18/82
FLT 4SA RUN 17 100KTS LONG. INPUT

VKT	99.998644	WEIGHT	16480.000	FSCG	359.59999	IMI	7.8999999
XA	5.2525152	X8	4.1226774	XC	4.8625791	XP	3.0781339
THETAB	.4525762-1	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0037036	GGAPM	89.872973











Figure 1f

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 8-DEC-82 13:07 (6/8)
 REFA TEST TAPE BHAWK4 8/18/82
 FLT 4SA RUN 17 LOOKTS LONG. INPUT

VKT 99.998644 WEIGHT 16480.000 FSCG 359.59999 IM1 7.8999999
 XA 5.2825152 XB 4.1226774 XC 4.8625791 XP 3.0781338
 THETAB .452576E-1 PHIB 0. OMGRAT 1.0037036 GGRPM 89.872973

Calculated

Test



ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 1g

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY

8-DEC-82

13:07

(7/8)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK4 3/18/82
FLT 4SA RUN 17 100KTS LONG. INPUT

VKT	99.999944	WEIGHT	16480.000	FSCG	359.59999	IHI	7.8999998
XA	5.2525152	XB	4.1226774	XCGRAT	4.8625791	XP	3.0781338
THETAB	.452576E-1	PHIB	0.		1.0037036	GGAPM	89.872973

Calculated

Test

OMGAR.

SAV402

OMGAR.

TST402







Figure 1h

BLACKHAWK - "NASA" STUDY 8-DEC-82 13:07 (8/8)

REFR TEST TAPE BRAWK4 8/18/82
FLT 4SA RUN 17 100KTS LONG. INPUT


VKT	99.998644	HEIGHT	16480.000	FSCG	359.59999	IH1	7.8999999
XA	5.2525152	XB	4.1226774	XC	4.8625791	XP	3.0781338
THETAB	.452576E-1	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0037036	GRAPH	89.872973

Calculated

--- AXP53 SAV402


Test

----- VX800T TST402




--- ATP53 SAV402

----- VT800T TST402




--- AZP53 SAV402

----- VZ800T TST402



--- QH800T SAV402

----- QH800T TST402



ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 2a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDT

15-FEB-83 14:29

ACFT TEST TYPE: BLACKHAWK3 11/22/82
FLY BEC RUN 12 140N15 LATERAL INPUT

VKT	148.00728	WEIGHT	16170.000	F30G	350.40000	IME	6.4899989
XA	5.4599657	XB	4.4215736	XC	7.4652258	XP	9.3919302
THETB	-6.0809729	PHIB	0.	GRANF	1.0037036	GGPM	94.868243

Calculated

----- PHIB SAV313

Test

----- PMIB TST313







Figure 2b

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY

15-FEB-83

14:29





REFR TEST TAPE BRANKS 11/22/82
PLF 84 AUG 12 1404CS LATERAL INPUT

WGT	144.00726	WEIGHT	16170.000	FSCG	350.00000	INT	6.4899999
XP	5.0599857	XB	4.1215736	XC	7.4652358	XP	3.399302
THETA	-6.0809729	PHI	0	ONCRNT	1.0037036	GNP	94.86243

Calculated Test

THETA THETA

SAVES13 TST313



SA 1114

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 2c

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 15-FEB-83 14:29
 TEST TIME 11/22/82
 FLI 68. NUM 12. WORKS LATERAL INPUT
 WGT 144.00725 WEIGHT 16170.000 FUEL 350.00000 INI 5.4899999
 XA 5.4599657 XB 0.4215736 XC 7.4652256 XP 3.3919302
 TIMEB -6.0809729 PHIB 0.0037036 ORGNAT 65.00000 94.866243

Calculated

PSIB SAV313

Test PSIB

TST313











Figure 2d

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 15-FEB-83 14:29

REF TEST TIME BHAWK3 15/22/82
FLY 59. RUN 12. LUNOTS LATERAL INPUT

VKT	144.00725	WEIGHT	15170.000	F3CG	350.40000	IME	5.4899999
XP	5.059957	XB	1.1215738	XC	7.4652258	XP	3.3919302
THETAB	-8.0600729	PHIB	0	OMGRAT	1.0037036	GGPWF	94.866243

Calculated		Test	
ALFME	SAW313	ALFME	TS313



SA 1114

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY Figure 3a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
REFR TEST TRACE 2HAWK2 7/28/82
FLT SOB JUN 27 HOVER COLL INPUT

23-NOV-82 10:07

(4/8)

VKT	399968E-3	WEIGHT	15910.000	FSCG	359.40000	IHI	44.400000
XA	5.1398469	XB	4.8870671	XC	5.9470320	XP	1.4421845
THETAB	4.4315225	PHIB	-2.6077761	CMGRAT	0.9955555	GGRPM	93.724715

Calculated

Test







Figure 3b

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
 REFR TEST TRACE BROWK2 7/28/82
 FLT SOB RUN 27 HOVER COLL INPUT

23-NOV-82

10:07

(5/8)


VKT	399968E-3	WEIGHT	15940.000	FSCG	359.40000	IM1	44.400000
XB	5.1398469	XB	4.8870671	XC	3.9470320	XP	1.4421843
PHETA8	4.4313225	PHI8	-2.507761	OMGRAT	0.9955555	GGAPM	93.724715

Calculated

Test


— ALFAF SAV210

----- ALFRE TST210




— BETFRE SAV210

----- BETFRE TST210




— LGMA SAV210

----- LGMA TST210



— BMAF SAV210

----- BMAF TST210



01.49
 24-NOV
 TST210
 JPCB
 SAV210
 .OUT

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY





Figure 3c

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 23-NOV-82 10:07 (7/8)

REFR TEST TRACE BHAWK2 7/29/82
FLT SOB RUN 27 HOVER COLL INPUT

VKT : 999988E-3 WEIGHT 15940.000 FSCG 359.40000
XA : 5.1398459 XB : 4.8870671 XC : 5.9470320
THETAB 4.4315225 PHIB : -2.6077761 OMGRAT 0.9955555

IHI 44.400000
XP 1.4421845
GGRPM 93.724715



SA 1114
01149
24-NOV
TST210
SAV210
IHI

Figure 3d

(8/8)

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
 REFA TEST TAPE 3HAWK2 7/28/82
 FLT 508 RUN 27 HOVER COLL INPUT

10:07

VKT 999968E-3
 XFA 5.1394469
 THETA8 4.4315225

WEIGHT 15940.000
 X8 4.8870671
 PH18 -2.6077761

FSCG 359.40000
 XC 5.9470320
 OMGRAT 0.9955555


IHI
 XP
 GGRPM

44.400000
 1.4421845
 93.724715

Calculated


AXP53 SAV210

TST210




ATP53 SAV210

TST210




AZP53 SAV210

TST210



QHBMH SAV210

TST210



ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 4a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY

15-FEB-83

09:59

(3/8)

REFR TEST TIME BAKING 11/22/82
FLT 56 RUN 27 140KTS PEDAL IMPUT

WGT 144.00755 HEIGHT 15410.000
XB 5.5054389 XC 7.2829869
PHIB -5.9303895 PHIB 1.0111110

6.5400000
3.3491829
94.533287

Calculated


Test

PSIB

SAV308

PSIB

TST308




ROEG

SAV308

ROEG

TST308




RODT

SAV308

RODT

TST308




XP

SAV308

XP

TST308



54 111

Figure 4b

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
REF: TEST TAPE BHAWK: 11/22/82
FLT 68. RUN 27. 140KTS. PEDAL INPUT.

15-533-83 09:59

(B-1)

[illegible]

Calculated

Test







Figure 4c

(2/8)

THE
XP
628164E-3
482E35-46
0000045

Test

SECRET




Figure 4d

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
REFR TEST TAKE OFF/CLIMB 11/22/82
FLI 56 RUN 27 INKOTS PEDRE INPUT

15-FEB-83 09:59

(5/8)

WGT 144.00755 HEIGHT 15410.000 F300 352.09999 IMT 6.5400000
XB 5.5054389 XB 4.3668036 XC 7.2620868 XP 3.3491829
THRE 5.5303805 PHIB 0.0 ORGMAF 1.0111110 GORPM 94.533287

Calculated

Test







Figure 5a

BLUANTHWA - NASA STUDY
 REPT TEST TAPE 8HAK2 7/28/82
 PLT 49A RUN 31 HOVER PEGAL INPUT

22-NOV-82 14:05

(1/8)

VKT	999960E-3	WEIGHT	15900.000	FSCG	359.50000	IHI	44.59000
XB	5.1382359	XB	4.9737837	XC	5.8695787	AP	1.482847
THETAB	4.4814032	PHI8	-2.5945056	OMGRAT	1.0000000	GGRPM	93.960199

Calculated

Test







Figure 5b

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
 REEF TEST TAPE SHAWN2 7/28/82
 FLT 49A RUN 31 HOVER PEDAL INPUT

22-NOV-82 14:05


(3/8)

VKT	999960E-3	WEIGHT	15900.000	FSCG	359.50000	IHI	44.690000
XP	5.1382359	XB	4.8737937	XC	5.8895767	XP	1.4523847
THETAB	4.4814032	PHIB	-2.5945056	OMGRAT	1.0000000	CGRPM	93.660199

Calculated


PSIB SAV207

Test
 PSIB




ROEG SAV207

ROEG TST207



ROBT SAV207

ROBT TST207



XP SAV207

XP TST207




Figure 6

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 29-NOV-82 15:12 (1/8)
 REF TEST TAPE BRAHMS 11/1/82
 FLT 25 RUN 30 60KTS LONGITUDINAL INPUT
 VKT 59.996385 WEIGHT 15810.000 FSCG 351.29999 IHI 31.599999
 XA 4.8413347 XB 5.8241637 XC 4.4628078 XP 2.6382460
 THETAB -2.6528021 PHIB 0.0 DMGRAT 0.9925925 GGRPM 38.431324







Figure 7

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 16-FEB-83 08:59 (1/8)

REFR TEST TAPE BHWK3 11/22/82

FLT 66 RUN 5 140KTS LONG INPUT SAS ON

VKT 121.99743 WEIGHT 16330.000 FSCG 350.50000 IHI 6.5400000

XA 5.3865692 XB 4.6193856 XC 3.9640386 XP 3.2628586





THETAB -3.5268830 PHIB 0. OMGRAT 1.0033333 GGAPM 91.780053

Calculated

THETAB SAV301

Test

THETAB TST301



SA 1114

18-12
22-PCB
TST301
TST301
TST301
TST301
TST301

Figure 8

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 16-FEB-83 09:07 (6/8)
 ACFT TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82
 FLI 66 RUN 14 140KTS COLL INPUT SAS ON

WKT	139.99773	WEIGHT	15940.000	PSCL	350.90080	INX	6.6999999
XA	5.4814162	XB	4.4619484	XC	7.1526744	XP	3.3640629
THETAB	-5.6468600	PHIB	0.	ORCAWT	1.0018518	GRAPHT	94.128872







FIGURE 99

BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION


LEVEL FLIGHT STAFFING TEST

SAS-ONI

SWATCHES: 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

===== CALCULATED DATA

0 FWD 0 ALEFA(19-24) FULTIN KUNS 8-21




BLAISEK HANIK, SIMUL-PRIN, MODEL, VALIDATION

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

STWILF0909-DELETED-NR66275-AUG2809

12-8 SIMON LINE 0 22-61) 22-61



SECRET

BLACK BOX SIMULATION MODEL VARIATION

AMERICAN DIPLOMATICAL SERVICE

THE

SECRET

187-182 500656 PULLEY, J. R. 1961. WYOMING




FIGURE 111

BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION

LATERAL / DIRECTIONAL STABILITY

V-560KNI

SWINGDOWN PSES 50-352 DEWATERIZED HIPSOSDET

CALCULATED 25-20 HIPSOSDET RUNS 25-40

W/ NONSTOP

ROLL ATTITUDE 94-DEG

TEST

CALCULATED

0-100

LONGITUDINAL STOK-PA

EXISTING MODEL

MODIFIED MODEL



COLLECTIVE STOK-PA

0-20 10 20
SIDE SLIP ANGLE - 3-DEG
BT

25-40

EXXON

10



Black Hawk Sluiceway Model Validation

Lateral/Directional Static Stability

VSI40 KIN

ANALYSIS: FSC03512 WREG0238 HWS0501
 CACEN (HWS) FITTING RUNS 21-26





FIGURE 13.0

FLACCHUANK SHANK ATTENTION MODEL VALUATION

LATERAL/DIRECTIONAL STABILITY

V=140 KN

CONSTRUCTION PROCESSING WITH SHANKS ATTENTION
OVERALL (1974) ELLIPSE SHANKS IN 26



FLARE HAZARD SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION

LONGITUDINAL STATIC STABILITY

CALCULATED DATA

0.00 A AREA 10-24 TEST DATA

60 KNOTS

100 KNOTS

1315 KNOTS

FLIGHT DIRECTION

WIND DIRECTION

WIND SPEED




FIGURE 140

STRUCTURAL SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION

LONGITUDINAL STATIC STABILITY

— CALCULATED DATA

○ TEST DATA

60 KNOTS 100 KNOTS 121.5 KNOTS

LEFT TURN 22° LEFT TURN 22° LEFT TURN 22° LEFT TURN 22°




FIGURE 150


BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL VARIATION

STEADY CLIMBS AND DESCENTS

CALCULATED DATA
 TEST DATA

60 KNOTS

PLT 201 RUNS 41-409



STEADY CLIMBS AND DESCENTS

OLAG HANNA SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION


STEADY CLIMES AND DESCENTS

CALCULATED DATA

0. AREA (75-24) IN STERNA

COCKNOTS

FLY 201 RUNS 25-215



[illegible]

Charles H. and Susan Ann Venable & Family


STANDARD AND BUREAU

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523	524	5
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

Blackboard Simulation Model Vampware

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

===== CALCULATED DATA
=====
===== SEE A(19-24) TEST DATA
=====

THE

[illegible]

10月24日

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

一、

1984

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

11-11-2011

1998

Winning

1992年12月12日

ROULEAU AUGUSTE

1991

FIGURE 16-B

STICK TURNER SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION

TURNED STEADY TURNS

———— CALCULATED DATA

○ TEST DATA

60 KNOTS

100 KNOTS

10-20 RUNS 52-54

10-16 RUNS 41-45






FIGURE 18C

BLIND HAWK SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION

TRIMMED STEADY-TURNS

CALCULATED DATA

0 ALEMAN (79-74) TEST DATA


600 KNOTS

FIG 26 RUNS 52-56

100 KNOTS

FIG 16 RUNS 41-45


Collective Stick-RO
 MAIN ROTOR POWER-LEVEL
 Load Factor-N-5



Collective Stick-RO
 MAIN ROTOR POWER-LEVEL
 Load Factor-N-5



Collective Stick-RO
 MAIN ROTOR POWER-LEVEL
 Load Factor-N-5



ROLL ANGLE-D-DEG

STC 17

STC


-71-

FIGURE TWO

BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION

ROTOR SPEED SWEEP

— CALCULATED DATA
O O A AREA (75-74) TEST DATA



ROTOR SPEED ~ 131.5 KNOTS

U S N O P R H L E

GRAPH PAPER

BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20315

RESEARCH DESIGN

CLIA AREA (2020) - TENNIS

60X-111

COX

2015

THE CHINESE

22-5886-1

卷之四

WYNN-DOTCOM BONEBANK

JOHN W. BROWN

DATE: 11/10/00

REPORT SPECIAL

11

FIGURE 10B

OLIVER HAWK Simulation Model Validation


STABILATOR ANGLE SWEEP

— CALCULATED DATA
O TEST DATA

60 KNOTS

PLT 20


RUNS 20-40



100 KNOTS

PLT 20

RUNS 60-7



137.5 KNOTS

PLT 19

RUNS 6-12




Figure 19a





BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 1-FEB-84 13:23
 REFA TEST TAPE BHAWK2 7/28/82 FLT 508 RUN 27
 HOVER COLL INPUT, LOS COLL LAG TAU = 0.0 SEC

(1/2)

VKT 999999E-3 WEIGHT 15940.000 FSCG 359.40000 IHI 44.400000
 XA 5.1311577 YB 4.8915395 XG 5.9401587 XH 1.4379850
 THETA 4.3629094 PHIB -2.5790894 OMGRAT 0.9355335 GGRPM 93.737382

Calculated

----- OMGR. Existing model ----- OMGR. Test



SA 1114

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 19b

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 1-FEB-84 13:23 (2/2)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK2 7/28/82 FLT 508 RUN 27
HOVER COLL INPUT, LOS COLL LAG TAU = 0.0 SEC

VKT	:999980E-3	WEIGHT	:5940.000	FSCG	359.40000	IM:	44.400000
XA	5.1311577	XB	4.8915395	XC	5.9401567	XP	1.4379850
THETAB	4.3629094	PHIB	-2.5790894	OMGRAT	0.9955555	GGRPM	93.737382

Calculated

----- ROOT Existing model

Test

----- ROOT TST210







Figure 20a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
 REFA TEST TAPE BHAWK2 7/28/82 FLT 508 RUN 27
 HOVER COLL INPUT, LDS COLL LAG TAU = 0.75 SEC

1-FEB-84





13:27

(1/2)

WKT	:999983E-3	WEIGHT	15940.000	FSCG	359.400000	IHI	44.400000
XA	5.1303934	X8	4.8912170	XC	5.9101001	XP	1.4365065
THETAB	4.3486081	PHIB	-2.5002522	OMGRAT	0.9955555	GGAPM	93.740830

Calculated

Test



(2/2)

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY

1004





Figure 21

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 13-APR-84 10:22 (1/2)





REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27

140 KN PEDAL INPUT, ITCALC + NMA=QHMA (s2)

VKT 144.00143- WEIGHT 15410.000 FSCG 352.09999 IHL 3.0690999

XB 5.5800265 XB PHIB 0.0 XC 7.2753286 XP 3.5403678

THETAB -3.7718707 QHGRAT 1.0111110 GGRPM 94.562789



ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 22a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 11-APR-84 14:24 (1/2)
 REFA TEST TAPE BHAWK2 7/28/82 FLT 508 RUN 27
 HOVER COLL INPUT, LOS LAG 0.75 SEC., UPDATED MODEL

VKT :999946E-3 WEIGHT 15940.000 FSCG 359.400000
 XA 5.207971 XB 4.9377300 XC 5.9503980
 THETAB 4.5816852 PHIB -2.4123701 OMGRAT 0.9955555
 IHI 39.000000
 XFP 1.6423207
 CGRPM 93.780563

Modified model
 _____ OMGRAT. Test
 _____ TST210








Figure 22b

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 11-APR-84 14:24 (2/2)
 REFA TEST TAPE BHAWK2 7/28/82 FLT 508 RUN 27
 HOVER COLL INPUT, LDS LAG 0.75 SEC., UPDATED MODEL


WKT	:999946E-3	WEIGHT	15940.000	FSCG	359.400000	IH1	39.000000
XA	5.2077971	XB	4.9377300	XC	5.9503980	XP	1.6423207
THETAB	4.5816852	PHIB	-2.4123701	OMGRAT	0.9955555	CGRPM	93.780563

Modified model


Test
 ----- ROOT TST210




----- LGMM TST210



----- OMGRM TST210



----- XC TST210




ENCLOSURE 3

BLACK HAWK SIMULATION MODEL VALIDATION

TAI ROTOR RIGGING

WEAVERS PROJECT 1924 AIRCRAFT IN TT-2516

YAW SYSTEMS AT 24° AND 34°



MAIN ROTOR COLLECTIVE 0-3 DEG

Figure 24a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 17-APR-84 11:13 (1/2)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
140 KN PEDAL INPUT, (eq) +DOWNWASH CORRECTION (s)

VKT	144.00239	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IHI	2.9257000
XA	5.8478359	X8	3.5036866	XC	7.2577255	XP	2.8745256
THETAB	-4.1980354	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GGPMM	94.608449







Figure 24b

BLACKHAWK -- NASA STUDY

17-APR-84 11:13





(2/2)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLI 66 RUN 27
140 KM PEDAL INPUT. (NEW) DOWNWASH CORRECTION (S)

VKT	144.00229	HEIGHT	15110.000	FSCG	352.09999	IHT	2.9257000
XA	5.8478359	XB	3.5036866	XC	7.2577255	YP	3.8715255
THETAB	-4.1990354	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GORPM	94.608449

Modified model

Existing model







[Handwritten signature]

Figure 25a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 18-APR-84 11:13 (1/2)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
140 KN PEDAL INPUT, (S) DMSHTR LAG 0.05 SEC (#6)





VKT 144.00261 WEIGHT 15410.000 FSCG 352.09999 IHI 2.9257000
XA 5.8472294 XB 3.5027564 XC 7.2570822 XP 2.8740942
THETRA -4.1925890 PHIB 0. QMGRAV 1.0111110 GGRAV 94.626825



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 25b

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 18-APR-84 11:13 (2/2)
 AERA TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
 140 KN PEDAL INPUT, (S) +OWSHTR LAG 0.05 SEC (#6)
 VKT 144.00261 WEIGHT 15410.000 FSCG 352.09999 IM1 2-9257000
 XA 5.8472294 XB 3.5027564 XC 7.2570822 XP 2.8740942
 THETAB -4.1925890 PHIB 0. OMGRAT 1.0111110 GURPM 94L 626825



SA 1111





01:25
 18-APR-84
 PLT
 1.726
 5-11-84

Figure 26

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 19-APR-84 16:53 (1/2)

REFR TEST TAPE BRAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
 140 KN PEDAL INPUT, (6) DASHTR ON V.I. (K=1.2) (68)

VKT 143.98855 WEIGHT 15410.000 FSCG 352.09999 IHI 2.9257000
 XP 5.5714135 XB 3.5263118 XC 7.2007847 XP 2.3521451
 THETAB -4.9339745 PHIB 0.0 DMRAT 1.0111110 GGRPM 94.510575



SA 1111





08:57
 17-487
 P.70
 .PCD
 SAV328
 .INT

Figure 27

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 19-APR-84 14:05 (1/2)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLI 66 RUN 27
 110 KN PEDAL INPUT, (*6)+H.T. ROLL DAMPING (*7)

VKT	144.00261	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.08999	IM1	2.9257000
XA	5.8472284	XB	3.5027564	XC	7.2570822	XP	2.8740942
THETA8	-6.1926890	PH18	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GGAPM	94.626825



SA 1111

Figure 28

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 25-APR-84 10:50 (1/2)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
 140 KN PEDAL INPUT, (a8)+1X1=-213.17Z=-66 (a11)

VKT	143.98852	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IHI	2.9257000
XA	5.5749978	X8	3.5361482	YC	7.1883819	XP	2.3576905
THETAB	-4.9409856	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GGAPM	94.469805







Figure 29

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 25-APR-84 10:59 (1/2)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
140 KN-PEDAL INPUT. (a11)+1.50+1XZ (2823.0) (a13)

VKT 143-98851 WEIGHT 15410.000 FSCG 352.09999 IMT 2-9257000
XA 5-5758578 XB 3-5382742 XC 7-1897209 XP 2-3595835
THETAB -4.9503082 PHLB 0. OMGRAT 1.0111110 GGRPM 94.456673







Figure 30a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 10-MAY-84 10:15 (1/8)

REFR TEST TAPE BRAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27

140 KN PEDAL INPUT, UPDATED MODEL (BASE 10)


VKT	143.98848	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IHI	2.9257000
XA	5.6086800	XB	3.5100016	XC	7.1882835	XP	2.2980709
THETAB	-4.9650708	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GGAPH	94.467986

Modified model

THETAB SAV334
THETAB TST308 Test


Existing model

THETAB SAV320




QDEG SAV334
QDEG TST308

QDEG SAV320




QDOT SAV334
QDOT TST308

QDOT SAV320



XB SAV334
XB TST308

XB SAV320



SA 1111

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 30b

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 10-MAY-84 10:15 (2/8)
 REFA TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
 140 KN PEDAL INPUT, UPDATED MODEL (BASE 10)

VKT	142.98848	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IH1	2.9257000
XA	5.6086800	X8	3.5100016	XCRAT	7.882835	XP	2.2980709
THETAB	-4.9650708	PH18	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GGPM	94.467986







Figure 30c

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 10-MAY-84 10:15 (3/8)
 REFA TEST TAPE BRAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
 140 KN PEDAL INPUT. UPDATED MODEL (BASE 10)


VKT	143.98848	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IH1	2.9257000
XA	5.6086800	XB	3.5100016	XC	7.1882835	XP	2.2980709
THETAB	-4.9650708	PHIB	0.	CMGRAT	1.0111110	CGRPM	94.467986

Modified model

PSIB SAV334
 PSIB TST308 Test


Existing model

PSIB SAV320




RDEG SAV334
 RDEG TST308

RDEG SAV320




ROOT SAV334
 ROOT TST308

ROOT SAV320



XP SAV334
 XP TST308

XP SAV320



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 30d

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 10-MAY-84 10:15 (4/8)
 REFA TEST TAPE BMAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
 140 KN PEDAL INPUT, UPDATED MODEL (BASE 10)

VKT	143.88848	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IHI	2.9257000
XA	5.608800	XB	3.5100016	XC	7.1682335	XP	2.2980709
THETAB	-4.9650708	PHI8	0.	DMGRAT	1.0111110	GGAPH	94.467986











Figure 30e

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 10-MAY-84 10:15 (5/8)
 REF TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
 140 KN PEDAL INPUT. UPDATED MODEL (BASE 10)

VKT	143.98848	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IM1	2.9257000
XA	5.6086800	XB	3.5100016	XC	7.1882835	XP	2.2980709
THETAB	-4.9650708	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GGPM	94.467986




BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 10-MAY-84 10:15 (6/8)

REFA TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
140 KN PEDAL INPUT, UPDATED MODEL (BASE 10)


VKT	143.98848	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IH1	2.9257000
XA	5.6086800	XB	3.5100016	XC	7.1882835	XP	2.2980709
THETAB	-4.9650708	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GGAPM	94.467986

Modified model


HPMA SAV334
HPMA TST308 Test



AXPS2 SAV334
CHAN15 TST308



ATPS2 SAV334
CHAN12 TST308



AZPS2 SAV334
CHAN16 TST308








Figure 30g

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 10-MAY-84 10:15 (7/8)
 REFA TEST TAPE BHPWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
 140 KN PEDAL INPUT. UPDATED MODEL (BASE 10)

VKT	143.98848	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IH1	2.9257000
XA	5.6088800	XB	3.5100016	XC	7.882835	XP	2.3980709
THETAB	-4.9650708	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GGAPH	94.467986



ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 30h

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 10-MAY-84 10:15 (8/8)
 REFA TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLI 66 RUN 27
 140 KN PEDAL INPUT, UPDATED MODEL (BASE 10)

VKT	143.98848	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IHI	2.9257000
XA	5.6088600	XB	3.5100016	XC	7.1882835	XP	2.2980709
THETAB	-4.9650708	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GGAPM	94.467986







Figure 31a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY
 REPA TEST TAPE BHAWK7 2/1/83
 FLT 188 RUN 21 100 KN PEDAL PULSE UPDATED MODEL


11-MAY-84 14:03

(1/8)

WKT	102.99197	WEIGHT	15900.000	FSCG	348.70000	IHL	7.8999999
XA	5.2311696	XB	4.8087167	XC	5.030511	XP	2.4586541
THETAB	-3.1043404	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0000000	GCAPM	89.544999

Modified model

Existing model



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 31b

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY

11-MAY-84 14:03





(2/8)

REFR TEST TAPE BHANK7 2/1/83
FLT 188 RUN 21 100 KM PEDAL PULSE UPDATED MODEL

WKT	102.99197	WEIGHT	15900.000	FSCG	348.70000	IHI	7.8999999
YR	52311698	XB	4.8087167	YC	5.030511	XP	2.4585411
THETAB	-3.1043404	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0000000	GGAPM	89.344999

Modified model

Existing model



SA 111

00-03
15-00
17-00
18-00
19-00
20-00
21-00
22-00
23-00
24-00
25-00
26-00
27-00
28-00
29-00
30-00
31-00
32-00
33-00
34-00
35-00
36-00
37-00
38-00
39-00
40-00
41-00
42-00
43-00
44-00
45-00
46-00
47-00
48-00
49-00
50-00
51-00
52-00
53-00
54-00
55-00
56-00
57-00
58-00
59-00
60-00
61-00
62-00
63-00
64-00
65-00
66-00
67-00
68-00
69-00
70-00
71-00
72-00
73-00
74-00
75-00
76-00
77-00
78-00
79-00
80-00
81-00
82-00
83-00
84-00
85-00
86-00
87-00
88-00
89-00
90-00
91-00
92-00
93-00
94-00
95-00
96-00
97-00
98-00
99-00
100-00
101-00
102-00
103-00
104-00
105-00
106-00
107-00
108-00
109-00
110-00
111-00
112-00
113-00
114-00
115-00
116-00
117-00
118-00
119-00
120-00
121-00
122-00
123-00
124-00
125-00
126-00
127-00
128-00
129-00
130-00
131-00
132-00
133-00
134-00
135-00
136-00
137-00
138-00
139-00
140-00
141-00
142-00
143-00
144-00
145-00
146-00
147-00
148-00
149-00
150-00
151-00
152-00
153-00
154-00
155-00
156-00
157-00
158-00
159-00
160-00
161-00
162-00
163-00
164-00
165-00
166-00
167-00
168-00
169-00
170-00
171-00
172-00
173-00
174-00
175-00
176-00
177-00
178-00
179-00
180-00
181-00
182-00
183-00
184-00
185-00
186-00
187-00
188-00
189-00
190-00
191-00
192-00
193-00
194-00
195-00
196-00
197-00
198-00
199-00
200-00
201-00
202-00
203-00
204-00
205-00
206-00
207-00
208-00
209-00
210-00
211-00
212-00
213-00
214-00
215-00
216-00
217-00
218-00
219-00
220-00
221-00
222-00
223-00
224-00
225-00
226-00
227-00
228-00
229-00
230-00
231-00
232-00
233-00
234-00
235-00
236-00
237-00
238-00
239-00
240-00
241-00
242-00
243-00
244-00
245-00
246-00
247-00
248-00
249-00
250-00
251-00
252-00
253-00
254-00
255-00
256-00
257-00
258-00
259-00
260-00
261-00
262-00
263-00
264-00
265-00
266-00
267-00
268-00
269-00
270-00
271-00
272-00
273-00
274-00
275-00
276-00
277-00
278-00
279-00
280-00
281-00
282-00
283-00
284-00
285-00
286-00
287-00
288-00
289-00
290-00
291-00
292-00
293-00
294-00
295-00
296-00
297-00
298-00
299-00
300-00
301-00
302-00
303-00
304-00
305-00
306-00
307-00
308-00
309-00
310-00
311-00
312-00
313-00
314-00
315-00
316-00
317-00
318-00
319-00
320-00
321-00
322-00
323-00
324-00
325-00
326-00
327-00
328-00
329-00
330-00
331-00
332-00
333-00
334-00
335-00
336-00
337-00
338-00
339-00
340-00
341-00
342-00
343-00
344-00
345-00
346-00
347-00
348-00
349-00
350-00
351-00
352-00
353-00
354-00
355-00
356-00
357-00
358-00
359-00
360-00
361-00
362-00
363-00
364-00
365-00
366-00
367-00
368-00
369-00
370-00
371-00
372-00
373-00
374-00
375-00
376-00
377-00
378-00
379-00
380-00
381-00
382-00
383-00
384-00
385-00
386-00
387-00
388-00
389-00
390-00
391-00
392-00
393-00
394-00
395-00
396-00
397-00
398-00
399-00
400-00
401-00
402-00
403-00
404-00
405-00
406-00
407-00
408-00
409-00
410-00
411-00
412-00
413-00
414-00
415-00
416-00
417-00
418-00
419-00
420-00
421-00
422-00
423-00
424-00
425-00
426-00
427-00
428-00
429-00
430-00
431-00
432-00
433-00
434-00
435-00
436-00
437-00
438-00
439-00
440-00
441-00
442-00
443-00
444-00
445-00
446-00
447-00
448-00
449-00
450-00
451-00
452-00
453-00
454-00
455-00
456-00
457-00
458-00
459-00
460-00
461-00
462-00
463-00
464-00
465-00
466-00
467-00
468-00
469-00
470-00
471-00
472-00
473-00
474-00
475-00
476-00
477-00
478-00
479-00
480-00
481-00
482-00
483-00
484-00
485-00
486-00
487-00
488-00
489-00
490-00
491-00
492-00
493-00
494-00
495-00
496-00
497-00
498-00
499-00
500-00
501-00
502-00
503-00
504-00
505-00
506-00
507-00
508-00
509-00
510-00
511-00
512-00
513-00
514-00
515-00
516-00
517-00
518-00
519-00
520-00
521-00
522-00
523-00
524-00
525-00
526-00
527-00
528-00
529-00
530-00
531-00
532-00
533-00
534-00
535-00
536-00
537-00
538-00
539-00
540-00
541-00
542-00
543-00
544-00
545-00
546-00
547-00
548-00
549-00
550-00
551-00
552-00
553-00
554-00
555-00
556-00
557-00
558-00
559-00
560-00
561-00
562-00
563-00
564-00
565-00
566-00
567-00
568-00
569-00
570-00
571-00
572-00
573-00
574-00
575-00
576-00
577-00
578-00
579-00
580-00
581-00
582-00
583-00
584-00
585-00
586-00
587-00
588-00
589-00
590-00
591-00
592-00
593-00
594-00
595-00
596-00
597-00
598-00
599-00
600-00
601-00
602-00
603-00
604-00
605-00
606-00
607-00
608-00
609-00
610-00
611-00
612-00
613-00
614-00
615-00
616-00
617-00
618-00
619-00
620-00
621-00
622-00
623-00
624-00
625-00
626-00
627-00
628-00
629-00
630-00
631-00
632-00
633-00
634-00
635-00
636-00
637-00
638-00
639-00
640-00
641-00
642-00
643-00
644-00
645-00
646-00
647-00
648-00
649-00
650-00
651-00
652-00
653-00
654-00
655-00
656-00
657-00
658-00
659-00
660-00
661-00
662-00
663-00
664-00
665-00
666-00
667-00
668-00
669-00
670-00
671-00
672-00
673-00
674-00
675-00
676-00
677-00
678-00
679-00
680-00
681-00
682-00
683-00
684-00
685-00
686-00
687-00
688-00
689-00
690-00
691-00
692-00
693-00
694-00
695-00
696-00
697-00
698-00
699-00
700-00
701-00
702-00
703-00
704-00
705-00
706-00
707-00
708-00
709-00
710-00
711-00
712-00
713-00
714-00
715-00
716-00
717-00
718-00
719-00
720-00
721-00
722-00
723-00
724-00
725-00
726-00
727-00
728-00
729-00
730-00
731-00
732-00
733-00
734-00
735-00
736-00
737-00
738-00
739-00
740-00
741-00
742-00
743-00
744-00
745-00
746-00
747-00
748-00
749-00
750-00
751-00
752-00
753-00
754-00
755-00
756-00
757-00
758-00
759-00
760-00
761-00
762-00
763-00
764-00
765-00
766-00
767-00
768-00
769-00
770-00
771-00
772-00
773-00
774-00
775-00
776-00
777-00
778-00
779-00
780-00
781-00
782-00
783-00
784-00
785-00
786-00
787-00
788-00
789-00
790-00
791-00
792-00
793-00
794-00
795-00
796-00
797-00
798-00
799-00
800-00
801-00
802-00
803-00
804-00
805-00
806-00
807-00
808-00
809-00
810-00
811-00
812-00
813-00
814-00
815-00
816-00
817-00
818-00
819-00
820-00
821-00
822-00
823-00
824-00
825-00
826-00
827-00
828-00
829-00
830-00
831-00
832-00
833-00
834-00
835-00
836-00
837-00
838-00
839-00
840-00
841-00
842-00
843-00
844-00
845-00
846-00
847-00
848-00
849-00
850-00
851-00
852-00
853-00
854-00
855-00
856-00
857-00
858-00
859-00
860-00
861-00
862-00
863-00
864-00
865-00
866-00
867-00
868-00
869-00
870-00
871-00
872-00
873-00
874-00
875-00
876-00
877-00
878-00
879-00
880-00
881-00
882-00
883-00
884-00
885-00
886-00
887-00
888-00
889-00
890-00
891-00
892-00
893-00
894-00
895-00
896-00
897-00
898-00
899-00
900-00
901-00
902-00
903-00
904-00
905-00
906-00
907-00
908-00
909-00
910-00
911-00
912-00
913-00
914-00
915-00
916-00
917-00
918-00
919-00
920-00
921-00
922-00
923-00
924-00
925-00
926-00
927-00
928-00
929-00
930-00
931-00
932-00
933-00
934-00
935-00
936-00
937-00
938-00
939-00
940-00
941-00
942-00
943-00
944-00
945-00
946-00
947-00
948-00
949-00
950-00
951-00
952-00
953-00
954-00
955-00
956-00
957-00
958-00
959-00
960-00
961-00
962-00
963-00
964-00
965-00
966-00
967-00
968-00
969-00
970-00
971-00
972-00
973-00
974-00
975-00
976-00
977-00
978-00
979-00
980-00
981-00
982-00
983-00
984-00
985-00
986-00
987-00
988-00
989-00
990-00
991-00
992-00
993-00
994-00
995-00
996-00
997-00
998-00
999-00
1000-00

Figure 31c

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 11-MAY-84 14:03 (3/8)
 REFA TEST TAPE BHAWK7 2/1/83
 FLT 188 RUN 21 100 KN PEDAL PULSE UPDATED MODEL

WKT	102.99197	WEIGHT	15900.000	FSCG	348.70000	IHI	7.89999999
XA	5.2311698	XB	4.8087467	XC	5.0304511	XP	2.4586541
THETAB	-3.1043404	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0000000	CSAPM	89.544999







Figure 31d

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 11-MAY-84 14:03 (4/8)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK7 2/1/83
FLT 188 RUN 21 100 KN PEDAL PULSE UPDATED MODEL

VKT	102.99197	WEIGHT	15900.000	FSCG	348.70000	IM1	7.8999999
XA	5.2311698	XB	4.8087467	XC	5.0304511	XP	2.4586541
THETAB	-3.1043004	PHIB	0.	OMERAT	1.0000000	CGRAT	89.544999







Figure 31e

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY

11-MAY-84 14:03

(5/8)

DATA TEST TAPE CHAWK7 2/1/83
FLT 188 RUN 21 100 KN PEDAL PULSE UPDATED MODEL


VKT	102.99197	WEIGHT	15900.009	FSCG	348.70000	IHT	7.8999999
XB	5.2911688	XB	4.8087467	XC	5.0301511	XP	2.4528541
THETAB	-3.1043404	PHIB	0.	CHGRAT	1.0000000	GGPPM	89.344999

Modified model

--- ALFRE SAV720
--- ALFRE TST709 Test


Existing model

--- ALFRE SAV709




--- BETFRE SAV720
--- BETFRE TST709

--- BETFRE SAV709




--- LGWR SAV720
--- LGWR TST709

--- LGWR SAV709



--- BRMR SAV720
--- BRMR TST709

--- BRMR SAV709



SA 1114





000-73
15-MAY
P. 1720
-FCI
SAV720
-JMT

Figure 31f

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 11-MAY-84 14:03 (6/8)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK7 2/1/83
 FLT 188 RUN 21 100 KN PEDAL PULSE UPDATED MODEL

VKT 102.99197 WEIGHT 15900.000 FSCS 348.70000 IH1 7.8999999
 XA 5.2311698 XB 4.8087457 XC 5.0304511 XP 2.4585541
 THETAB -3.1043404 PHIB 0.0 GRAT 1.0000000 GAPP 89.5449999



SA 1111

00-05
 18-457
 PLT720
 .PCD
 SAV720
 .DNT

Figure 31g

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY

11-MAY-84 14:03





(7/8)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK7 2/1/83
FLT 188 RUN 21 100 KN PEDAL PULSE UPDATED MODEL

VKT	102.99197	WEIGHT	15900.000	FSCG	348.70000	IM1	7.8999999
XB	5.2311696	XB	4.8087467	XC	5.0304511	XP	2.4526541
THETAB	-3.1043404	PHIB	0.	OMCRAT	1.0000000	GGAPH	89.544999

Modified model

Existing model



BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 11-MAY-84 14:03 (8/8)

REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK7 2/1/83
FLT 188 RUN 21 100 KN PEDAL PULSE UPDATED MODEL

WKT	102.98197	WEIGHT	15900.000	FSCG	348.70000	IHI	7.8999999
XA	5.2311696	XB	4.8087467	XC	5.030511	XP	2.4586341
THETAB	-3.1043404	PHIB	0.	OMERAT	1.0000000	GRAPH	89.544999











Figure 32a

BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 10-MAY-84 09:18 (1/2)
 REPT TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
 TWO KN PEDAL INPUT. UPDATED MODEL (BASE 10)

VKT	143.98846	WEIGHT	15410.000	FSCG	352.09999	IHI	2.9257000
XB	5.5137821	XB	3.3195564	XC	7.1786173	XP	2.3012870
THETAB	-4.9918442	PHIB	0.	OMGRAT	1.0111110	GMGRAT	94.427228

Modified model



SA 1114


09:07
 11-MAY
 11:00
 11:00
 11:00
 11:00

Figure 32b


BLACKHAWK - NASA STUDY 10-MAY-84 09:18 (2/2)
 REFR TEST TAPE BHAWK3 11/22/82 FLT 66 RUN 27
 140 KM PEDAL INPUT. UPDATED MODEL (BASE 10)
 VKT 143.98846 WEIGHT 15410.000 FSCG 352.09999 IHT 2.9257000
 XA 5.6131821 XB 3.5195684 XC 7.1786173 XP 2.3012870
 THETAB -4.9918442 PHIB 0. QMGARAT 1.0111110 GGMAT 94.427228

Modified model


POEG SAV335




POEG SAV335



POEG SAV335



XP SAV335



APPENDIX I

MODIFIED DOWNWASH CORRECTION TERMS

[REF. P 510-9 REFERENCE (3)]

$$Y_{ADD} = -26.5 \cdot Q_{FRE}$$

$$L_{ADD} = - (160 - 7.5 \beta_{WF}^{\circ}) Q_{FRE}$$

$$N_{ADD} = 26.2 \cdot Q_{FRE}$$

$$\text{IF } \beta_{WF}^{\circ} < 0^{\circ} \quad M_{AD} = 38.9 \cdot \beta_{WF}^{\circ} \quad \text{LIMIT } M_{AD} > -259$$

$$M_{ADD} = M_{AD} \cdot Q_{FRE}$$

$$\text{IF } \beta_{WF}^{\circ} > 0^{\circ} \quad M_{AD} = 58.4 \cdot \beta_{WF}^{\circ} \quad \text{LIMIT } M_{AD} < 336$$

$$M_{ADD} = M_{AD} \cdot Q_{FRE}$$

$$\text{IF } \beta_{WF}^{\circ} \leq -30^{\circ} \quad \beta_{WF}^{\circ} = -30^{\circ}$$

$$\text{IF } \beta_{WF}^{\circ} \geq 30^{\circ} \quad \beta_{WF}^{\circ} = 30^{\circ}$$

APPENDIX II

REVISED EQUATIONS OF MOTION

BODY AXES ACCELERATIONS

REF. P 5.10-G REFERENCE(3)

$$V_{XB DOT} = (g/w_{BO})(SUM X_B - w_{BO} \sin \theta_B) + r \cdot V_{YB}' - g \cdot V_{ZB}'$$

$$V_{YB DOT} = (g/w_{BO})(SUM Y_B + w_{BO} \cos \theta_B \sin \phi_B) + p \cdot V_{ZB}' - r \cdot V_{XB}'$$

$$V_{ZB DOT} = (g/w_{BO})(SUM Z_B + w_{BO} \cos \theta_B \cos \phi_B) + q \cdot V_{XB}' - p \cdot V_{YB}'$$

$$P DOT = (A \cdot D + B \cdot G + C \cdot H) / J$$

$$Q DOT = (A \cdot G + B \cdot E + C \cdot I) / J$$

$$R DOT = (A \cdot H + B \cdot I + C \cdot F) / J$$

WHERE: $A = SUM L_B - g \cdot h_z + r \cdot h_y$

$$B = SUM M_B - r \cdot h_x + p \cdot h_z$$

$$C = SUM N_B - p \cdot h_y + q \cdot h_x$$

$$h_x = p \cdot I_x - q \cdot I_{xy} - r \cdot I_{xz}$$

$$h_y = q \cdot I_x - r \cdot I_{yz} - p \cdot I_{xy}$$

$$h_z = r \cdot I_z - p \cdot I_{xz} - q \cdot I_{yz}$$

